


Accepted Manuscript

Ozonized water as an alternative to alcohol-based hand disinfection

Hans Johan Breidablik, Dag Einar Lysebo, Lene Johannessen, Åse Skare, John Roger Andersen, Ole T. Kleiven



PII: S0195-6701(19)30056-8

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2019.01.026>

Reference: YJHIN 5657

To appear in: *Journal of Hospital Infection*

Received Date: 4 December 2018

Accepted Date: 29 January 2019

Please cite this article as: Breidablik HJ, Lysebo DE, Johannessen L, Skare Å, Andersen JR, Kleiven OT, Ozonized water as an alternative to alcohol-based hand disinfection, *Journal of Hospital Infection*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2019.01.026>.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Title

Ozonized water as an alternative to alcohol-based hand disinfection

Authors

Hans Johan Breidablik

Center of Health Research, Førde Hospital Trust, Førde, Norway

Dag Einar Lysebo

Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen, Norway

Lene Johannessen

Thelma Indoor Air & Working Environment AS, Microbiology Department, Trondheim,
Norway

Åse Skare

Førde Hospital Trust, Department for Infection Control, Førde, Norway

John Roger Andersen

Faculty of Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, Førde, Norway

Ole T. Kleiven

Faculty of Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, Førde, Norway

Corresponding author:

Hans Johan Breidablik

hans.johan.breidablik@helse-forde.no

Center of Health Research, Førde Hospital Trust, Svanehaugvegen 2, 6812 Førde, Norway

Tel. +47 90182853

Fax. +47 57839795

Running title:

Ozonized water in hand disinfection

Summary

Background: Hand hygiene plays a vital role in the prevention of transmission of microorganisms. Ozone (O₃) is a highly reactive gas with a broad spectrum of antimicrobial effects on bacteria, viruses and protozoa. It can easily be produced locally in small generators, and dissolved in tap water, and quickly transmits into ordinary O₂ in the surrounding air.

Aim: To compare ozonized tap water and alcohol rub in decontamination of bacterially-contaminated hands.

Methods: A cross-over study among 30 nursing students. Hands were artificially contaminated with *Escherichia coli* (ATCC 25922) then sanitized with ozonized tap water (0.8 or 4 ppm) or 3 mL standard alcohol-based rub (Antibac 85%). The transient microbes from fingers were cultivated and colony-forming units (CFU)/mL were counted. The test procedure was modified from European Standard EN 1500:2013.

Findings: All contaminated hands before disinfection showed a CFU-count >30,000/mL. The average bacterial counts in (CFU/mL) on both hands combined were 1017 (SD, 1391) after using ozonized water, and 2337 (SD, 4664) after alcohol hand disinfection. The median values were 500 (range, 6700) and 250 (range, 16000) respectively, a non-significant difference (P = 0.713). Twenty percent of participants reported adverse skin effects (burning/dryness) from alcohol disinfection compared with no adverse sensations with ozone.

Conclusion: Ozonized tap water is an effective decontaminant of *E. coli*, and could be an alternative to traditional alcohol fluid hand disinfectants both in healthcare institutions and public places. Ozonized water may be particularly valuable for individuals with skin problems.

Keywords: Ozone, alcohol rub, hand disinfection, *E. coli*

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Introduction

Our interest in ozone as an alternative hand disinfectant started several years ago when two eye surgeons in our hospitals developed hand dermatitis and had to stop performing operative procedures. Both got permission to use ozone gas in tap water in their preoperative hand hygiene, and this solved their skin problems. In the same period, there was an outbreak of *Giardia lamblia* infection in the city of Bergen, Norway, originating from the domestic water supply, and many kindergartens were advised to start using ozonized tap water in hand hygiene for children, as it was known that ozone could eradicate protozoans [1]. Some kindergartens continued using ozone as hand disinfection for several years after, and the staff reported a clear impression that both the children and staff had fewer infectious diseases during this period (Christine Andreassen, personal communication). We are also experiencing a global threat from multidrug-resistant bacteria, and the need to reduce the use of broad-spectrum antibiotics [2]. Hand disinfection has thus become even more important as a preventive procedure.

Ozone gas (O_3) was probably first detected by a Dutch chemist (van Marum), but the first systematic studies were done by Christian Friedrich Schönbein in around 1840 [3]. He noted the characteristic smell around an electrifier and named the gas based on the Greek word “ozein” (scent) [4]. Ozone is produced from electric generators when an electrical discharge (a spark) splits an oxygen molecule into two oxygen atoms, and then the unstable ozone molecule is formed according to the reaction $O + O_2 \rightarrow O_3$. According to the balanced equation $2O_3 \rightleftharpoons 3O_2$, where ozone quickly decomposes into O_2 ($t_{1/2} = 20\text{--}30$ min), requires that it must be produced in the location where it is used. When it decomposes, O_3 acts as an oxidant with release of free radicals. Being an oxidant, ozone has antimicrobial properties

against bacteria, viruses and protozoa [5], and it was first used for general disinfection of water. Later, ozone was used in food hygiene, fish farming, air purification, hot tubes, and in some areas of medicine, especially dentistry [6].

Ozone leads to the destruction of both bacteria and viruses [7, 8], by interfering with metabolism, most likely by inhibiting enzymes. Some ozone breaks through the bacterial cell membrane, and this leads to cell death. Ozone destroys viruses by diffusing through the protein coat into the nucleic acid core, resulting in damage to the viral RNA. At higher concentrations, ozone destroys the capsid by oxidation [9].

Ozone is toxic to humans at higher concentrations, especially to the lungs. The Norwegian Labour Inspection Authority accepts an 8-h working day average exposure of 0.1 ppm, and this can be exceeded by 200% for periods of 15 min [10]. This limits the use of ozone gas as a disinfection agent in surroundings with human activity. However, the gas can be dissolved in tap water for hand washing, and most of the gas then passes in the water through the outlet of the sink.

Hand hygiene is one of the most important tools available for reducing the spread of transient microbial pathogens in healthcare and community settings. In the era of multidrug-resistant bacteria and frequent outbreaks of viral gastroenteritis, hand disinfection has become an even more essential tool in reducing the spread of microorganisms both in health institutions and in general society [11]. The main disinfection methods used are handwashing with soap and alcohol-based solutions [12]. However, both of these are associated with adverse skin reactions like dryness and dermatitis among sensitive individuals, and compliance with hygiene recommendations is also variable among health professionals [13, 14]. Among nurses, 25–55% report adverse skin reactions related to hand hygiene procedures [15]. Meanwhile, the effect of alcohol disinfection on viruses like norovirus and rotavirus is

unclear, and it has little effect on spores of the bacterium *Clostridium difficile* [14]. Ozone gas in higher concentration has also shown to be an effective alternative for sanitizing rooms [16, 17].

There have been few studies on the potential of using ozonized water as a simple, cheap and skin-friendly alternative to standard hand disinfection with alcohol. Appelgrein et al. found ozone to be inferior in effect to propanolol-based hand rubs [18]. Isosu et al. found ozonized water combined with benzalkonium chloride and alcohol to be an effective alternative to traditional surgical washing procedures [19]. In an unpublished study where ATP was used as an indication of the efficacy of hand disinfection, Liceaga et al. found that ozone combined with soap removed 97.3% of ATP from hands, and noted the lack of studies regarding ozone and hand sanitation [20]. In a recent study, Nakamura et al. found that a 3 log₁₀ cfu reduction was achieved by washing hands with ozonated water or antimicrobial soap and water. However, ozonated water was not significantly superior to non-antimicrobial soap and water [21].

The aim of this study was to compare the effect on *Escherichia coli*-contaminated hands of ozonized water with standard alcohol-based hand disinfection using a modified European Standard procedure (EN 1500:2013) [22].

Materials and methods

The test procedure was modified from European Standard EN 1500:2013, which specifies a method for simulating practical conditions for establishing whether a product for hygienic hand sanitation reduces the release of transient microbes after use on the artificially-contaminated hands of volunteers. For testing one product at a time, a crossover design was

used. The 30 test persons were all nursing students (26 women/4 men) at the end of their second year of study (average age 23 years). None of the students had visible signs of dermatitis on their hands during the study days. On day one, the 30 students were divided randomly into two equal groups of 15, one using ozonized water 0.8 ppm and the other 4.0 ppm. Six days later the same students used the reference disinfectant, ethanol supplemented with propan-2-ol (Antibac, 85% with glycerol, www.antibac.no). The test organism was non-pathogenic *E. coli* (ATCC® 25922), as recommended in the standard procedure. This bacterial strain is often used as a reference strain in microbial research.

E. coli was cultured for 18–24 h at 36 °C on Tryptic Soy Agar plates (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA). A single colony was then inoculated into 10 mL Tryptic Soy Broth (TSB), and cultivated for 18–24 h. The 10-mL bacterial solution was then used to inoculate 1 L TSB before further cultivation for 18–24 h. The final concentration of cultured *E. coli* was estimated as $>10^9$ colony-forming units (CFU)/mL. The 1 L solution was divided into two 500-mL glass containers.

The test subjects prepared their hands by washing for 1 min with soft soap and lukewarm tap water to remove natural transients. The hands were then dried with paper towels, and immersed up to the mid-metacarpals for 5 s, one hand in each of the glass vessels containing bacterial solution. Hands were air-dried in a horizontal position with the fingers spread and rotating for 3 min. Immediately after drying, the fingertips were rubbed on the base of a Petri dish containing 10 mL of TSB using separate Petri dishes for each hand. Without further delay, the test subject then performed the hygienic hand rub procedure, using ozonized water or the reference hand rub (3 mL of 85% Antibac) according to information provided by the manufacturer. The hygienic hand rubbing time for both ozone water and Antibac was 30 s. After cleaning, the fingertips were dried and rubbed on the base of new Petri dishes containing 10 mL of TSB. Immediately after performing the tests, 1 mL of pre-

or postvalue sampling fluid was transferred into Eppendorf tubes (Thermo Fisher Scientific), and brought to the laboratory in a cooling bag. Within 24 h, 10 μ L of the pre-or postvalue samples were spread on two parallel MacConkey agar plates (Mac3, Thermo Fisher Scientific) and incubated for 18–24 h at 36 ± 1 °C before counting the number of CFU. The pre-test value was the number of CFU sampled from the left or right hand prior to hand sanitization treatment, and the post-test value was the number of CFU after treatment. Calculation of CFU/mL was performed by multiplying the arithmetic mean of the plate CFU counts for each hand by the dilution factor of 100. For both reference and test procedures, the counts from the right or left hand of each subject were averaged separately to obtain pre-values and post-values. CFU counts >300 per 10 μ L were not counted and were noted as $>30,000$ CFU/mL.

Ozonized water was produced by two separate generators, a Water Ozonator CYS300C from Cleanzone delivering 0.8 ppm in tap water, and a BioSure CSS from Ozone Scandinavia delivering 4.0 ppm in tap water. For measuring the ozone gas concentration in surrounding air, three different sensors were used (EcoZone Monitor, EZ-1X, Eco Sensors, Inc. type A-21ZX and Murco Portable Ozone Detectorand), and we also measured the level of ozone in the tap water. The tap water was regular domestic water of approximately 20°C from the local water reservoir in Førde, Norway. Water here is filtered through a layer of marble sand, and then disinfected with chlorine and UV light. It has a pH of 7.8–8.3 [23]. The tap water-flow were different. For the ozone 0.8 ppm generator the flow was about 8 L/min, while the 4.0 ppm the BioSure CSS delivered only 2 L/min.

Ethics

The students were informed in a lesson about the study and invited to participate. The resulting participants gave their written consent. The study was approved by the Regional Committee for Medical Research Ethics and the Norwegian Data Inspectorate (reference number: 2017/943).

Statistical analysis

Categorical data is presented with numbers and percentages. The raw data (CFU/mL) after using ozonized water and alcohol disinfection are displayed within figures. CFU/mL values from both hands combined after using ozone water and alcohol disinfection are presented as the average values along with standard deviations (SD), and also as the medians with ranges. CFU/mL scores from each hand are presented as average values. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to test for differences in CFU/mL values after using ozone water or alcohol disinfection. The Mann-Whitney U-test was used to test if CFU/mL was different using ozone water with 4,0 ppm versus 0,8 ppm. A P-value < 0.05 was considered significant. The analysis was conducted using SPSS software version 24, and figures were prepared using GraphPad Prism version 8.

Results

All 30 participants completed the study. Eight of the students (27%) reported varying degrees of previous skin problems connected to handwashing and disinfection.

In connection to the experiment, 20% of participants reported some adverse skin effects (burning/dryness) from using the alcohol disinfection method, but continued the

procedure as planned. Their post-CFU counts showed no special pattern. None reported adverse sensations using ozonized water. Half of the participants reported that they felt their hands became smoother/softer after ozone use, and after the experiment the majority (77%) said they would prefer ozonized water disinfection if the two methods were equal in antimicrobial effect.

Table I summarizes the bacteriological results. From all 60 hands (30 participants, each with left and right hand) the pre-tests gave a CFU count $>30\,000$ /mL. The average post-test value for both hands combined in CFU/mL after using ozonized water was 1017 (SD, 1391), and for regular alcohol hand disinfection was 2337 (SD, 4664). The median post-test value (in CFU/mL) after using ozonized water was 500 (range, 6700), and for regular alcohol hand disinfection was 250 (range, 16 000), $P=0.713$. Where disinfection used the higher ozone concentration (4.0 ppm), values were not statistically different in CFU/mL compared to those for the lower concentration (0.8 ppm) ($P=0.142$).

More hands ($n = 26$) showed zero post-value CFU-counts from fingers using alcohol versus ozone ($n = 10$) (Figure 1). There was greater individual variation in the CFU-counts for alcohol (0–12,500) compared with ozone (0–4800), especially for the left hand. Skin symptoms from alcohol disinfection earlier or during the study was not correlated with higher CFU-counts in post-tests.

The measured level of ozone gas in the air around the face-level of the students never exceeded 0.01 ppm (one-tenth of the exposure limit of 0.1 ppm for 8 h). However, when asked afterwards, 77% of the students reported they had noticed the characteristic smell of ozone gas, which also represent an extra security factor in connection with ozone use.

Discussion

This study indicated that ozonized water on average eradicates *E. coli* from artificially-contaminated fingers as effectively as 85% alcohol. The variation in results between individuals, and between the two hands of the same individual, was higher for alcohol disinfection than disinfection using ozonized water. The concentration of ozone gas in the surrounding air was low, and there were no adverse skin reactions with the ozone method. The ozone method was preferred by most of the nursing students. The ozone hand disinfection method is simple, cheap and leaves no residual waste, and when dissolved in water ozone also seems to be safe.

Our conclusion is that ozonized water could be an alternative to traditional fluid hand disinfectants with alcohol, for example in institutions. Appelgrein et al. also found an effect of ozone, but this was inferior to alcohol [19]. In their study with 4.0 ppm ozone, they used a lower concentration of alcohol (60%), but the amount was double (3+3 ml) and the exposure time was longer (3 min.), and also on one of the hands they used a delayed 3 hour method. It is therefore not comparable in all the details to our study.

The seemingly better effect of 0.8 ppm ozone compared to 4.0 ppm was surprising, but both the different technical design of the generators and especially the different water flow could be possible explanations for this observation. Under ideal circumstances we should have used the same generator producing different concentrations, but CYS 300C can only deliver 0.8 ppm at maximum output.

Other studies have shown that the presence of organic carbon in water can severely reduce ozone effectiveness when used as a method to eradicate the bacterial load [24].

In the present study, we found differences in effect between the left hand and right hand in CFU-counts post-disinfection with alcohol, but less difference with ozone. Fierera et al. found significant heterogeneity in bacterial community composition between left and right hands from the same individual depending on handedness, gender and time since last hand washing [25]. We do not have data on the handedness of our participants. However, the spreading of a sparse amount of alcohol disinfectant (3 ml) to all parts of both hands can be more difficult, even under ideal circumstances, than the simpler procedure of just holding and rubbing both hands under a greater volume of running tap water (8 L/min) containing ozone. The inferior results for ozone 4.0 ppm when delivered in only 2 L/min of water could also point in this direction.

Adverse skin reactions connected to hand hygiene are prevalent among health professionals [12]. Among the participants in this study, 20% of the participant reported adverse skin effects (burning/dryness) from using the alcohol disinfection method whereas none reported these problems when using ozonized water. We find this to be an interesting observation. The standard method for comparing hand disinfectants (EN 1500:2013) has been criticized for not being in line with clinical practice, and for not testing microorganisms other than *E. coli* [26]. To be more in line with the present advised practice in healthcare institutions, we modified the Standard by using only 3 mL/30 s for alcohol hand disinfection, and used a higher concentration of alcohol (Antibac 85%) than the 60% in the Standard.

This study was performed in optimal circumstances with well-informed and professional healthcare students knowing the background and correct technique for hand disinfection. The hand disinfection with alcohol was administrated and observed by a nurse specializing in hygiene. The effect of hand wash/hand disinfection on contaminated hands can therefore be expected to be poorer in general public health circumstances, and especially among children. The broad-spectrum antimicrobial effect of ozone, including naked viruses

and protozoa, could represent an important potential in public health efforts aimed at communicable diseases. We have not found any publication regarding the potential for developing bacterial resistance to ozone. This study confirms that ozonized water possesses antimicrobial properties in line with alcohol, and that it could have a place in effective hand hygiene protocols, especially targeted at individuals with skin problems. For some, this becomes a major problem resulting in sick leave and, eventually, working disability. This was the situation for one of the authors of this study (DEL) before he obtained permission to use ozone in his preoperative hand disinfection procedure.

There are few studies about the effect of ozone as an antimicrobial agent in human medicine. We need further studies comparing regular hand washing with soap vs. ozonized water, and on the use of ozonized water as primary prevention of prevalent infections in schools and kindergartens. Research should also focus on the possibility of using ozone as an alternative to soap washing and alcohol disinfection for persons with contact dermatitis.

References

- [1] Wensaas KA, Langeland N, Rortveit G. Prevalence of recurring symptoms after infection with *Giardia lamblia* in a non-endemic area. *Scand J Prim Health Care* 2009; **27**: 12-7. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19085428>.
- [2] World Health Organization. WHO global strategy for containment of antimicrobial resistance (2001). https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/66860/WHO_CDS_CSR_DRS_2001.2.pdf?sequence=1.
- [3] Rubin MB. The history of Ozone. The Schonbein Period, 1839-1868. *BullHistChem* 2001; **26**: 40-56. <http://acshist.scs.illinois.edu/awards/OPA%20Papers/2001-Rubin.pdf>.
- [4] Schonbein CF. London Edinburgh Philos. J. Sci 1838: 43-5. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14786443908649658?journalCode=tphm14>
- [5] Scott DB, Leshner EC. Effect of Ozone on Survival and Permeability of *Escherichia Coli*. *J Bacteriol* 1963; **85**: 567-76. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14174901>.
- [6] Azarpazhooh A, Limeback H. The application of ozone in dentistry: a systematic review of literature. *J Dent* 2008; **36**: 104-16. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18166260>.
- [7] Bocci V. Autohaemotherapy after treatment of blood with ozone. *J Int Med Res* 1994; **22**: 131-44. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/030006059402200301>.
- [8] Bocci V. A reasonable Approach for the Treatment of HIV Infection in the Early Phase with Ozonotherapy (Autohaemotherapy). How 'Inflammatory' Cytokines may have A therapeutic Role. *Mediators Inflamm* 1994; **3**: 315-21. <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/mi/1994/618102/abs/>.

- [9] Ozone Solutions. Ozone effects on specific bacteria, viruses and molds. 451 Black Forest Rd. Hull, IA 51239 USA: Ozone Solutions 2014. <https://www.ozonesolutions.com/info/ozone-effects-on-pathogens>.
- [10] The Norwegian Labour Inspection Authority. The Working Environment Act 704-ENG Regulations concerning Action and Limit Values. Oslo: 2016. <https://ansatt.oslomet.no/en/hse-legislation>.
- [11] Aiello AE, Coulborn RM, Perez V, Larson EL. Effect of hand hygiene on infectious disease risk in the community setting: a meta-analysis. *Am J Public Health* 2008; **98**: 1372-81. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18556606>.
- [12] Pittet D, Allegranzi B, Boyce J. The World Health Organization guidelines on hand hygiene in health care and their consensus recommendations. *Epidemiology* 2009; **30**: 611-22. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19508124>.
- [13] Erasmus V, Daha TJ, Brug H, Richardus JH, Behrendt MD, Vos MC *et al*. Systematic review of studies on compliance with hand hygiene guidelines in hospital care. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2010; **31**: 283-94. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20088678>.
- [14] Fagernes M, Sorknes N. Hand hygiene, National recommendations. Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo: 2017. https://fhi.no/globalassets/dokumenterfiler/rapporter/veileder/handhygiene-2017_smittevern23-med-omslag-.pdf.
- [15] Hand Hygiene Australia (HNA). 3rd. edition, 2012. <https://www.hha.org.au/>.
- [16] Hudson JB, Sharma M, Petric M. Inactivation of Norovirus by ozone gas in conditions relevant to healthcare. *J Hosp Infect* 2007; **66**: 40-5. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17350729>.
- [17] Martinelli M, Giovannangeli F, Rotunno S, Trombetta CM, Montomoli E. Water and air ozone treatment as an alternative sanitizing technology. *J Prev Med Hyg* 2017; **58**: 48-52. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28515631>.
- [18] Appelgrein C, Hosgood G, Dunn AL, Schaaf O. Ozonated water is inferior to propanol-based hand rubs for disinfecting hands. *J Hosp Infect* 2016; **92**: 340-3. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26832646>.
- [19] Isosu T, Kan K, Hayashi T, Fujii M. [The effectiveness of ozonated water for hand washing before surgery]. *Masui* 2001; **50**: 672-5. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11452482>.
- [20] Liceaga A, Mercado E, Narcaroti M, Liceaga I. Hand hygiene skin ATP study: Hand washing with tap water and soap vs. ozonated water and soap vs. antiseptic and ozonated water vs. antiseptic and tap water. In: Becker's Healthcare, Ed. *Clinical Leadership & Infection Control*. Unpublished results 2017. <https://www.beckershospitalreview.com/quality/hand-hygiene-skin-atp-study-hand-washing-with-tap-water-and-soap-vs-ozonated-water-and-soap-vs-antiseptic-and-ozonated-water-vs-antiseptic-and-tap-water.html>.
- [21] Nakamura K, Saito K, Kashiwazaki J, Aoyagi T, Arai K, Hara Y *et al*. Evaluation of ozonated water using ASTM E1174 for standardized testing of handwash formulations for healthcare personnel. *J Hosp Infect*. 2018 100(2):211-213. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29452243>.
- [22] National Standard Norway. NS-EN 1500: 2013, Chemical disinfectants and antiseptics - Hygienic handrub - Test method and requirements (phase 2/step 2). Oslo 2013. <http://www.standard.no/en/webshop/search/?search=NS-EN+1500>.
- [23] Førde Municipality. Information about domestic water supply. Førde: 2018. <https://www.forde.kommune.no/tenester/avfall-veg-vatn-og-eigedom/veg-vatn-og-avlop/drikkevatt-og-vassverk/>.
- [24] Westerhoff P, Aiken G, Amy G, Debroux J. Relationships between the structure of natural organic matter and its reactivity towards molecular ozone and hydroxyl radicals. 1999; **33**: 2265-76. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0043135498004473>.

- [25] Fierer N, Hamady M, Lauber L, Knight R. The influence of sex, headedness, and washing on the diversity of hand surface bacteria. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2008; 46: 17994-9. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19004758>.
- [26] Kampf G, Marschall S, Eggerstedt S, Ostermeyer C. Efficacy of ethanol-based hand foams using clinically relevant amounts: a cross-over controlled study among healthy volunteers. *BMC Infect Dis* 2010; **10**: 78. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20338067>.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Acknowledgment

We thank the nurse students for their participation and assistance in performing this study, and two bioengineers at the Microbiological Department of Førde Hospital, Torill Aarø and Torunn Ytreland, for their excellent assistance.

The study had a small internal financial grant from Helse Førde Medical Trust, and no external grants.

Potential conflicts of interest: One of the authors (DEL) has a small ownership in a firm that manufactures ozone generators. For the other authors: Nothing to declare.

Table I. Data for *Escherichia coli* cultivation CFU/mL (colony-forming units/mL). Samples were taken from left and right hands treated with a standard solution of non-pathogenic *E. coli* (ATCC® 25922), then disinfected with ozonized tap water (ozone) or alcohol rub (alcohol; Antibac, 85% v/v). All pre-tests had CFU > 30 000/mL.

Hands	Ozone (0.8 and 4.0 ppm combined)	Ozone (0.8 ppm)	Ozone (4.0 ppm)	Alcohol (85%)
Both hands, mean (SD)	1017 (1391)	600 (643)	1433 (1795)	2337 (4664)
Both hands, median (range)	500 (6700)	300 (2500)	700 (6600)	250 (16000)
Right hand, mean (SD)	550 (942)	240 (232)	860 (1256)	797 (2147)
Right hand, median (range)	300 (4800)	200 (800)	400 (4800)	100 (10500)
Left hand, mean (SD)	467 (574)	360 (526)	573 (617)	1540 (3294)
Left hand, median (range)	250 (2000)	200 (2000)	300 (1800)	100 (12500)

N = 30 in all analyses. SD: Standard deviation.

Figure Legends

Figure 1a: Individual distribution of CFU-counts/mL after disinfection of hands with 3 mL of 85% alcohol for 30 s, and fig. 1b: Individual distribution of CFU-counts/mL after disinfection of hands with ozonized water for 30 s.

Illustration 1. Equipment (generators) used for ozonization of tap water: BioSure CSS and CYS300C



Model	BioSure CSS
Ozone concentration in water	2–8 ppm
Voltage	100V – 240V, 50/60Hz
Energy Usage	60 watts
Size (in.)	17.1 x 12.9 x 6.9
Weight	7.5 kg

Model:	CYS300C
Ozone Output:	0.5 gr/hr
Ozone Concentration in Water:	0.4 - 0.8 ppm
Ozone Concentration in Air:	0.04 - 0.08 ppm
Voltage:	110V - 250V, 50/60Hz
Energy Usage:	9 watts
Size (WxHxD):	5.3" × 7.4" × 2.3" 135 mm × 188 mm × 58 mm
Weight:	0.62 kg / 1.4 lb






Figure 1a




Figure 1b