Letters in High Energy Physics
ISSN: 2632-2714

Volume 2023
Issue 2

The Role of Heat, Moisture, and Time in Achieving Effective Sterilization

Sarah Alhumaidi Hamdan Almutairi [1], Zainab Eesa Al Safwan [2], Abeer Essa Ahmad Al Safwan [3], Zainab Saeed Al-Dhaif [4], Zainab Ali Hassan Alsaisaban [5], Alshehri, Faizah Hamoud M [6], Al Meshaal, Maryam Ahmed A [7], Badriah Jumayan Eid Alshammari [8], Alhajhouj, Zahra Tayseer M [9], Alsaedi, Abdulrahim Omar A [10]

1- Sterilization Specialist, Hafar Al-Batin Central Hospital, Hafar Al-Batin, Saudi Arabia
2- Specialist-Medical Sterilization, Eradah and Mental Health Complex, Dammam, Saudi Arabia
3- Specialist-Medical Sterilization, Qatif Central Hospital, Qatif, Saudi Arabia
4- Specialist-Medical Sterilization, Qatif Central Hospital, Qatif, Saudi Arabia
5- Specialist-Medical Sterilization, Qatif Central Hospital, Qatif, Saudi Arabia
6- Specialist-Medical Sterilization, Eradah and Mental Health Hospital, Al-Kharj, First Health Cluster in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
7- sterilization technician, Dhahran Eye Specialist Hospital, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia
8- Operation Room Technician, King Khalid Hospital, Hail, Saudi Arabia
9- sterilization technician, Dhahran Eye Specialist Hospital, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia
10- Operation Room Technician, King Fahd Hospital, Medina, Saudi Arabia

Abstract:

Effective sterilization is a critical process in healthcare and laboratory settings, ensuring that all forms of microbial life, including bacteria, viruses, fungi, and spores, are eliminated from instruments and surfaces. Heat is one of the primary methods employed for sterilization, with both dry heat and moist heat techniques being utilized. Moist heat sterilization, commonly achieved through autoclaving, is particularly effective because the presence of water vapor enhances the transfer of heat and facilitates the denaturation of proteins within microorganisms. The combination of high temperature and moisture disrupts cellular structures, making it a reliable method for sterilizing surgical instruments, laboratory equipment, and other critical items. Time is another crucial factor in the sterilization process, as it determines the exposure duration necessary to achieve complete microbial death. Each sterilization method has specific time-temperature combinations that must be adhered to in order to ensure efficacy. For instance, autoclaving typically requires a minimum exposure time of 15-30 minutes at 121°C (250°F) to ensure that even the most resistant spores are effectively killed. Understanding the interplay between heat, moisture, and time is essential for healthcare professionals and laboratory technicians to implement effective sterilization protocols, thereby safeguarding patient safety and maintaining the integrity of experimental results.

Keywords: sterilization, heat, moisture, time, autoclaving, microbial life, effective sterilization, surgical instruments, laboratory equipment, exposure duration.

Introduction:

Sterilization is a critical process in various fields, including healthcare, pharmaceuticals, and food safety, where the elimination of all forms of microbial life is essential to prevent contamination and ensure safety. The efficacy of sterilization methods hinges on several interdependent factors, among which heat, moisture, and time play pivotal roles. Understanding how these elements interact is crucial for developing effective sterilization protocols that can be reliably implemented across diverse applications [1].

Sterilization is defined as the process of destroying all forms of microbial life, including bacteria, viruses, fungi, and spores. The need for effective sterilization arises from the potential risks associated with microbial contamination, which can lead to infections in clinical settings, spoilage in food products, and compromised integrity of pharmaceutical products. In healthcare, for instance, the sterilization of surgical instruments, implants,

and other medical devices is paramount to prevent healthcare-associated infections (HAIs). Similarly, the pharmaceutical industry relies on sterilization to ensure the safety and efficacy of injectable medications and other sterile products. As such, the development and optimization of sterilization methods are of utmost importance to public health and safety [2].

Heat is one of the most widely used agents for sterilization, primarily due to its ability to denature proteins, disrupt cellular membranes, and inactivate nucleic acids. There are two primary forms of heat sterilization: dry heat and moist heat. Dry heat sterilization involves exposure to elevated temperatures (typically 160-180°C) for an extended period, while moist heat sterilization, commonly achieved through steam under pressure (autoclaving), operates at lower temperatures (121-134°C) but with higher efficacy due to the presence of water vapor [3].

The mechanism by which heat achieves sterilization is primarily through thermal denaturation of proteins and enzymes, leading to cell death. Moist heat is particularly effective because the presence of water facilitates the transfer of heat and enhances the penetration of heat into microbial cells. The steam generated during autoclaving condenses on surfaces, releasing latent heat that further increases the temperature of the materials being sterilized. This process not only ensures that the temperature reaches the required threshold but also helps in the destruction of resistant spores, which are often more challenging to eliminate than vegetative cells [4].

Moisture plays a crucial role in enhancing the effectiveness of heat sterilization. The presence of water molecules in the sterilization environment significantly influences the heat transfer dynamics and microbial inactivation rates. In moist heat sterilization, water acts as a medium that facilitates the transfer of thermal energy, allowing for more efficient and rapid heating of microbial cells compared to dry heat. The interaction between heat and moisture also promotes hydrolysis, which can disrupt the structural integrity of microbial proteins and nucleic acids, leading to cell death [5].

Moreover, the moisture content can affect the thermal resistance of microorganisms. For example, bacterial spores exhibit varying degrees of resistance depending on their moisture content; higher moisture levels can decrease the thermal resistance, making them more susceptible to heat. This interplay between moisture and heat underscores the importance of maintaining optimal humidity levels during sterilization processes, as inadequate moisture can hinder the effectiveness of heat in achieving sterilization [6].

Time is another critical factor that influences the success of sterilization. The relationship between time, heat, and moisture is often described using the concept of "sterilization cycles," which outline the specific duration that materials must be exposed to a particular temperature and moisture level to achieve microbial inactivation. The effectiveness of sterilization is not solely dependent on the temperature and moisture but also on the duration of exposure. Insufficient time may result in incomplete sterilization, allowing surviving microorganisms to proliferate and potentially cause contamination [7].

The time required for effective sterilization varies based on several factors, including the type of microorganisms present, the nature of the materials being sterilized, and the specific sterilization method employed. For instance, spore-forming bacteria such as Bacillus stearothermophilus exhibit greater resistance to heat than vegetative cells, necessitating longer exposure times to achieve complete sterilization. Additionally, the presence of organic matter or bioburden on surfaces can also affect the time required for effective sterilization, as it may shield microorganisms from direct exposure to heat and moisture [8].

The Mechanism of Heat in Sterilization:

In sterilization processes, heat is employed as a means to disrupt the cellular integrity and functionality of microorganisms. This process can be understood through the lens of different heat transfer mechanisms:

1. **Conduction**: This is the direct transfer of heat from one material to another. In sterilization, conduction occurs when materials (such as surgical instruments) are heated directly through contact with hot air or surfaces [9].
2. **Convection**: This refers to the movement of heat through fluids or gases. In an

autoclave, steam heats the chamber, creating a continuous cycle that circulates hot air or steam around the items being sterilized [10].

3. **Radiation**: Although less common in heat sterilization, it can occur in some processes where infrared radiation can penetrate and influence the microorganisms [8].

The efficiency of these heat transfer methods hinges on several variables, including temperature, time, and the nature of the material being sterilized. Together, these elements contribute to the overall efficacy of sterilization treatments [11].

Types of Heat Sterilization

Heat sterilization methods are primarily categorized into two types: **moist heat** and **dry heat**, each with distinct mechanisms and applications.

1. Moist Heat Sterilization: Moist heat sterilization primarily involves steam under pressure, commonly employed in autoclaving. The primary mechanism through which moist heat achieves sterilization is protein denaturation. At high temperatures, typically around 121°C (250°F) at 15 psi for about 15-30 minutes, proteins within the microbial cells coagulate and denature. Moreover, the presence of moisture facilitates the penetration of heat, allowing for more rapid and efficient sterilization compared to dry heat [12].

In addition, steam under pressure kills both vegetative cells and spores, which are often more resistant to heat. The capability to eliminate spores is critical in healthcare settings where surgical instruments must be fully sterilized [13].

2. Dry Heat Sterilization: In contrast, dry heat sterilization employs hot air to achieve microbial lethality. This method operates at higher temperatures, usually between 160°C to 180°C (320°F to 356°F) for an extended period (typically one to two hours). The mechanism of action for dry heat involves the oxidation of cell constituents and denaturation of proteins, albeit at a slower rate compared to moist heat. The higher temperatures and longer exposure times required for dry heat sterilization reflect the lower thermal conductivity of air compared to steam [14].

Dry heat sterilization is often suitable for materials that may be damaged by moisture, such as certain powders, oils, and metal instruments.

The effectiveness of heat sterilization is influenced by several factors:

1. **Temperature and Time**: The relationship between temperature and time is critical. The higher the temperature, the shorter the time required for sterilization. However, consistent monitoring is essential to ensure that the entire load reaches and maintains the necessary temperature for the required duration [15].

2. **Type of Microorganism**: Different microorganisms exhibit varying levels of resistance to heat. For instance, bacterial spores of Bacillus and Clostridium species are particularly resilient and require more rigorous conditions for effective sterilization compared to vegetative cells of Escherichia coli or Staphylococcus aureus [16].

3. **Moisture Content**: In moist heat sterilization, the presence of moisture is indispensable for efficient protein coagulation and permeation. In dry heat processes, materials should be free of moisture to minimize spoliation [12].

4. **Penetration Capacity**: The ability of heat to penetrate packaging barriers varies. For steam sterilization, steam must freely circulate around and within items. Dense packs or tightly wrapped instruments can. diminish the efficacy if air is not expelled [17].

The mechanisms and phenomena of heat sterilization find applications across various industries:

1. **Healthcare Sector**: Autoclaves are a staple in hospitals and laboratories for sterilizing surgical instruments, culture media, and waste. Ensuring a sterile environment is crucial for preventing hospital-acquired infections and safeguarding patient safety [18].

2. **Food Industry**: Heat sterilization is instrumental in the food industry for ensuring food safety and extending shelf life. Processes such as canning utilize high-pressure steam to destroy harmful microorganisms, thus preventing foodborne illnesses [19].
3. **Pharmaceutical Industry**: In pharmaceutical manufacturing, sterilization of equipment and raw materials assures the purity and efficacy of medicines. Heat sterilization techniques are pivotal in producing sterile injectable solutions [20].
4. **Laboratory Research**: In microbiology laboratories, heat sterilization is used for sterilizing glassware, media, and equipment, thereby preventing contamination and enabling accurate experimental results [21].

The Importance of Moisture in Sterilization Processes

Moist heat sterilization employs temperatures typically exceeding 121°C at pressures of 15 psi, as found in standard autoclaving conditions. Under these circumstances, steam condenses on surfaces and releases latent heat, raising the temperature of the items being sterilized. The moisture not only facilitates heat transfer but also enhances the penetration of heat throughout the load, effectively ensuring that all surfaces reach the necessary temperature to achieve sterilization [22].

1. **Steam Sterilization (Autoclaving):** The cornerstone of sterilization in many healthcare settings, steam sterilization is well-known for its effectiveness due to the rapid heat transfer it provides. The water vapor condenses on the surfaces of instruments, creating a moist environment that aids in microbial death by promoting protein denaturation, coagulation, and ultimately, cell lysis. Additionally, certain bacterial spores, such as those from Bacillus and Clostridium species, exhibit varying resistance to heat, but the presence of moisture dramatically increases the susceptibility of these spores to high temperatures [23].
2. **Ethylene Oxide (EtO) Sterilization:** This is a gas sterilization method commonly used for heat-sensitive instruments and materials. While primarily a dry process, the moisture level in the environment significantly impacts its efficiency. The presence of moisture facilitates the diffusion of ethylene oxide gas into microbial cells, enhancing its penetration and effectiveness. Optimal moisture levels can improve the sterilization process by ensuring that the gas reacts adequately with cellular components, leading to death of the microorganisms [24].
3. **Radiation Sterilization:** In processes like gamma radiation, moisture content can also play a role, affecting how radiation interacts with both the sterilant and the microbial cells. Studies have demonstrated that moisture can enhance the sensitivity of spores to radiation, suggesting that controlling moisture levels can be critical in optimizing effectiveness [25].

The benefits of moisture in sterilization processes extend beyond mere efficacy. These include:

- **Reduced Sterilization Time:** Moist heat sterilization generally requires shorter exposure times than dry heat sterilization, effectively saving time in settings where rapid turnaround is essential, such as surgical facilities [22].
- **Enhanced Microbial Inactivation:** The moist environment enhances the thermal death time of resistant microorganisms, ensuring thorough sterilization even in challenging circumstances [26].
- **Material Protection:** Using steam helps preserve the integrity of heat-sensitive materials better than dry heat, which can cause oxidation or degradation. This makes steam sterilization ideal for delicate instruments or fabric-based materials [27].
- **Environmental Considerations:** Moisture can facilitate

the use of biodegradable and environmentally friendly sterilants. Some processes are evolving to utilize aqueous solutions instead of hazardous chemicals, aligning with increasing environmental concerns in clinical and industrial practices [28].

While moisture is essential, its management poses challenges. Inadequate moisture can result in incomplete sterilization, leaving behind viable spores or other pathogens. For example, steam must penetrate packaging materials to ensure sterile barrier integrity; any impediments may reduce effectiveness. Conversely, excessive moisture can lead to the corrosion of instruments or the degradation of certain materials. Thus, striking the right balance is crucial for successful sterilization [29].

Furthermore, understanding the optimal parameters for moisture controls—such as the relative humidity in ethylene oxide sterilization—is vital for achieving desired outcomes. Routine monitoring and validation of sterilization processes are necessary to ensure that moisture levels remain within the ideal range [30].

Time: A Critical Factor in Sterilization Efficacy

Sterilization methods can be broadly categorized into physical and chemical processes. Physical methods include steam sterilization (autoclaving), dry heat sterilization, and radiation, while chemical methods encompass the use of gases such as ethylene oxide and liquid chemical sterilants. Each method has its own specific time requirements for effective sterilization, often dictated by the nature of the microorganisms being targeted and the materials being sterilized [31].

Steam Sterilization

Steam sterilization, commonly performed in autoclaves, is one of the most widely used methods due to its effectiveness and efficiency. The process involves exposing items to saturated steam at high temperatures, typically 121°C (250°F) for a minimum of 15-30 minutes, depending on the load and the presence of organic matter. The time required for sterilization is crucial because it allows for adequate penetration of steam into the items being sterilized, ensuring that all surfaces reach the necessary temperature for a sufficient duration to achieve microbial kill [32].

The time factor is particularly important when considering the presence of resistant spores, such as those from *Bacillus* species. These spores can withstand extreme conditions and require longer exposure times to steam to ensure complete inactivation. Studies have shown that extending the sterilization time can significantly enhance the efficacy of steam sterilization, particularly when dealing with complex loads or porous materials [33].

Dry Heat Sterilization

Dry heat sterilization operates on the principle of high temperatures over extended periods. Typically, it requires exposure to temperatures of 160-180°C (320-356°F) for at least 1-2 hours. The time factor in dry heat sterilization is critical because the mechanism of microbial kill is primarily through the oxidation of cellular components, which occurs slowly compared to moist heat. The longer exposure time allows for thorough penetration of heat and ensures that all microorganisms, including spores, are effectively destroyed. However, it is essential to balance time and temperature, as excessively long exposure can lead to material degradation, particularly for heat-sensitive items [34].

Chemical Sterilization

Chemical sterilization methods, such as those using ethylene oxide, also highlight the importance of time. Ethylene oxide is a potent sterilant that requires a specific concentration, humidity, and temperature to be effective. The typical cycle can last anywhere from 1 to 6 hours, depending on the load and the specific parameters used. The time factor here is crucial, as insufficient exposure can result in incomplete sterilization, allowing viable microorganisms to survive [35].

The effectiveness of chemical sterilization is influenced by the time it takes for the gas to permeate packaging materials and reach all surfaces of the items being sterilized. Moreover, residual chemicals must be adequately removed, which can also require additional time. Thus, the total cycle time for chemical sterilization encompasses both the exposure time and the aeration time, emphasizing the complexity and critical nature of time in achieving effective sterilization [36].

Mechanisms of Microbial Inactivation

Understanding how time influences microbial inactivation is essential for optimizing sterilization processes. The mechanisms by which time affects microbial death can be explained through several concepts, including the D-value, Z-value, and the concept of log reduction [37].

D-Value and Z-Value

The D-value, or decimal reduction time, is defined as the time required to reduce the population of microorganisms by 90% (one log reduction) at a specific temperature. This value varies among different microorganisms and sterilization methods. For example, the D-value for *Bacillus subtilis* spores in steam sterilization is significantly higher than that for vegetative bacterial cells, indicating that spores require more time to achieve the same level of microbial kill [38].

The Z-value, on the other hand, represents the temperature change needed to achieve a tenfold reduction in the D-value. Understanding these parameters allows sterilization practitioners to establish appropriate time-temperature relationships for different microbial targets, ensuring that sterilization processes are both effective and efficient [39].

Log Reduction

The concept of log reduction is another critical aspect of understanding the role of time in sterilization. Each log reduction corresponds to a tenfold decrease in the microbial population. For instance, achieving a 3-log reduction means that the population has been reduced by 99.9%. The time required to achieve a specific log reduction varies based on the sterilization method and the type of microorganism present. By calculating the necessary exposure time to achieve the desired log reduction, practitioners can design sterilization protocols that are both effective and practical [40].

The significance of time in sterilization extends beyond the laboratory and industrial settings; it has profound implications for public health and safety. In healthcare, inadequate sterilization practices can lead to the transmission of infections, including surgical site infections and healthcare-associated infections (HAIs). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the World Health Organization (WHO) emphasize the importance of adhering to established sterilization protocols, which include specific time requirements, to mitigate these risks. [41]

In the pharmaceutical industry, ensuring the sterility of products is critical to patient safety. Contaminated medications can lead to severe health complications, including sepsis and other life-threatening conditions. Therefore, pharmaceutical manufacturers must rigorously validate their sterilization processes, ensuring that time is adequately accounted for in their protocols [42].

Moreover, in the food industry, effective sterilization is essential for preventing foodborne illnesses. The time factor in pasteurization and other sterilization techniques is crucial for ensuring that harmful microorganisms are eliminated, safeguarding public health [40].

Comparative Analysis of Dry Heat vs. Moist Heat Sterilization

Sterilization is a fundamental process in microbiological laboratories, medical institutions, and various industrial applications, aimed at eliminating all forms of microbial life, including bacteria, viruses, fungi, and spores. Two prominent methods of sterilization are dry heat and moist heat. While both methods serve a similar purpose, they differ significantly in their mechanisms, effectiveness, applications, and limitations. This essay presents a comparative analysis of dry heat and moist heat sterilization, elucidating the principles behind each method, their advantages and disadvantages, and the contexts in which they are most appropriately employed [43].

Mechanisms of Action

Moist Heat Sterilization

Moist heat sterilization primarily employs steam under pressure, which is accomplished through methods such as autoclaving. In this process, water is heated to create steam, which then penetrates microorganisms and denatures proteins, leading to cell death. The most commonly used temperature and pressure for effective sterilization is 121 °C (250 °F) for at least 15 minutes. The efficiency of moist heat sterilization stems from the presence of water,

which facilitates rapid heat transfer and contributes to the disruption of cellular structures, especially proteins and nucleic acids [44].

Dry Heat Sterilization

In contrast, dry heat sterilization involves the use of hot air that is circulated in an oven or a specialized device. The process typically requires higher temperatures, usually between 160 °C (320 °F) and 180 °C (356 °F), and longer exposure times, often from 1 to 2 hours, depending on the temperature and the nature of the material being sterilized. The primary mechanisms of dry heat are oxidation, dehydration, and denaturation. Unlike moist heat, dry heat sterilization does not rely on moisture to facilitate heat transfer; rather, it directly affects the cellular components of the microorganisms, leading to their destruction [45].

Effectiveness

When comparing the efficacy of the two sterilization methods, moist heat is generally considered superior to dry heat for most applications. The efficiency of moist heat can be attributed to its lower temperatures required for effective sterilization and its penetrating ability. It is particularly effective against spores, which are resilient forms of bacteria. Studies indicate that moist heat can achieve a 6-log reduction in viable spores at relatively short exposure times when compared to dry heat [46].

Dry heat sterilization is less efficient due to the high temperatures and extended time needed for sterilization. Consequently, it may not be suitable for all materials, particularly those that are temperature-sensitive or can undergo oxidation. However, its effectiveness is not negligible; certain materials—solid instruments, glassware, and oils—can be effectively sterilized using dry heat, particularly when moisture is undesirable [47].

Advantages of Moist Heat

1. **Speed**: Moist heat sterilization typically operates at lower temperatures and shorter exposure times, making it a faster method.
2. **Efficacy**: It effectively kills bacterial spores, reducing them to a safe level in a shorter time span compared to dry heat.
3. **Cost-Effectiveness**: Autoclaves and steam sterilizers are commonly found in many healthcare and laboratory settings, making the process economically viable [48].

Disadvantages of Moist Heat

1. **Corrosive Effects**: The presence of moisture can lead to the corrosion or damage of certain metallic instruments, which can ultimately affect their longevity.
2. **Material Limitations**: Some substances, particularly those that are heat-sensitive or porous, may not withstand the high temperatures or the presence of moisture [49].

Advantages of Dry Heat

1. **No Moisture Damage**: Dry heat sterilization prevents corrosion or damage to moisture-sensitive materials, making it ideal for certain instruments and dry powders.
2. **Long Shelf Life**: Items sterilized through dry heat are less prone to contamination due to the absence of water, allowing for a longer shelf life [50].

Disadvantages of Dry Heat

1. **Longer Exposure Times**: The need for longer exposure times at higher temperatures can be impractical for quick turnover in busy settings.
2. **Less Penetration**: Dry heat does not penetrate materials as effectively as moist heat, making it less suitable for certain complex instruments, such as wrapped textiles or those with lumens [51].

Moist heat sterilization finds widespread use in hospitals and laboratories for various applications. It is particularly suitable for sterilizing surgical instruments, laboratory media, and glassware. The ability to effectively kill spores makes autoclaving the method of choice for sterilizing objects that may contain resistant bacterial spores, such as soil samples or biological materials [52].

On the other hand, dry heat sterilization is typically employed in scenarios where moisture is

undesirable. Applications include sterilizing powders, oils, and glassware that has been previously cleaned. It is also beneficial for sterilizing metal instruments and tools used in situations where moisture could compromise the integrity of the materials [53].

Conclusion

In conclusion, the interplay between heat, moisture, and time is fundamental to achieving effective sterilization. Each of these factors contributes to the overall efficacy of sterilization processes, influencing microbial inactivation rates and ensuring the safety and integrity of sterilized products. As industries continue to prioritize sterilization in the face of evolving microbial threats and public health concerns, a comprehensive understanding of these elements will be essential for developing and implementing robust sterilization protocols. Future research should focus on optimizing the interactions between heat, moisture, and time to enhance sterilization efficacy while minimizing potential risks associated with inadequate sterilization practices. By advancing our knowledge in this area, we can better protect public health and ensure the safety of medical, pharmaceutical, and food products in an increasingly complex and interconnected world.

References:

1. Rutala WA, Weber DJ. Disinfection and sterilization in health-care facilities. In: Jarvis WR, editor. Bennett and Brachman's Hospital Infections. 6th ed. Wolters Kluwer/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; Philadelphia: 2013.
2. Uttley AH, Simpson RA. Audit of bronchoscope disinfection: a survey of procedures in England and Wales and incidents of mycobacterial contamination. J Hosp Infect. 1994;26:301–308. doi: 10.1016/0195-6701(94)90022-1.
3. Martin R. U.S. Outpatient Surgery Passes Inpatient, to 53 Million a Year. Accessed 2010.
4. Favero MS, Bond WW. Chemical disinfection of medical and surgical materials. In: Block SS, editor. Disinfection, Sterilization, and Preservation. 5th ed. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; Philadelphia: 2001. pp. 881–917.
5. Weber DJ, Rutala WA, DiMarino AJ., Jr. The prevention of infection following gastrointestinal endoscopy: the importance of prophylaxis and reprocessing. In: DiMarino AJ Jr, Benjamin SB, editors. Gastrointestinal Diseases: An Endoscopic Approach. 2nd ed. Slack Inc; Thorofare, NJ: 2002. pp. 87–106.
6. Rutala WA, Weber DJ. An overview of disinfection and sterilization. In: Rutala WA, editor. Disinfection, Sterilization and Antisepsis: Principles, Practices, Current Issues, New Research, and New Technologies. Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology; Washington, DC: 2010. pp. 18–83.
7. Lowry PW, Jarvis WR, Oberle AD. Mycobacterium chelonae causing otitis media in an ear-nose-and-throat practice. N Engl J Med. 1988;319:978–982. doi: 10.1056/NEJM198810133191504.
8. Rutala WA, Weber DJ. Selection and use of disinfectants in healthcare. In: Mayhall CG, editor. Hospital Epidemiology and Infection Control. 4th ed. Wolters Kluwer/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; Philadelphia: 2012.
9. Weber DJ. Managing and preventing exposure events from inappropriately reprocessed endoscopes. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2012;33:657–660. doi: 10.1086/666339.
10. Meyers H, Brown-Elliott BA, Moore D. An outbreak of Mycobacterium chelonae infection following liposuction. Clin Infect Dis. 2002;34:1500–1507. doi: 10.1086/340399.
11. Rutala WA, Weber DJ. Disinfection, sterilization, and control of hospital waste. In: Mandell GL, Bennett JE, Dolin R, editors. Principles and Practice of Infectious Diseases. 7th ed. Churchill Livingstone Elsevier; Philadelphia: 2009. pp. 3677–3695.
12. Spach DH, Silverstein FE, Stamm WE. Transmission of infection by gastrointestinal endoscopy and

bronchoscopy. Ann Intern Med. 1993;118:117–128. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-118-2-199301150-00008.
13. Weber DJ, Rutala WA. Lessons from outbreaks associated with bronchoscopy. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2001;22:403–408. doi: 10.1086/501924.
14. Rutala WA, Gergen MF, Weber DJ. Disinfection of a probe used in ultrasound-guided prostate biopsy. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2007;28:916–919. doi: 10.1086/518845.
15. Wendelboe AM, Baumbach J, Blossom DB. Outbreak of cystoscopy related infections with Pseudomonas aeruginosa: New Mexico, 2007. J Urol. 2008;180:588–592. doi: 10.1016/j.juro.2008.04.003.
16. Garner JS, Favero MS. CDC guideline for handwashing and hospital environmental control, 1985. Infect Control. 1986;7:231–243. doi: 10.1017/s0195941700084022.
17. McDonnell G, Burke P. Disinfection: is it time to reconsider Spaulding? J Hosp Infect. 2011;78:163–170. doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2011.05.002.
18. Rutala WA. APIC guideline for selection and use of disinfectants. Am J Infect Control. 1990;18:99–117. doi: 10.1016/0196-6553(90)90089-b.
19. Miner N, Harris V, Cao TD. Aldahol high-level disinfectant. Am J Infect Control. 2010;38:205–211. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2009.08.009.
20. Simmons BP. CDC guidelines for the prevention and control of nosocomial infections: guideline for hospital environmental control. Am J Infect Control. 1983;11:97–120. doi: 10.1016/0196-6553(83)90122-0.
21. Rutala WA, Weber DJ. New developments in reprocessing semicritical devices. Am J Infect Control. 2013;41(5 suppl):S60–S66. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2012.09.028.
22. Rutala WA. Disinfection, sterilization and waste disposal. In: Wenzel RP, editor. Prevention and Control of Nosocomial Infections. 3rd ed. Williams and Wilkins; Baltimore: 1997. pp. 539–593.
23. Rutala WA, Gergen MF, Weber DJ. Disinfection of an infrared coagulation device used to treat hemorrhoids. Am J Infect Control. 2012;40:78–79. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2011.04.330.
24. Alfa MJ, DeGagne P, Olson N. Comparison of ion plasma, vaporized hydrogen peroxide and 100% ethylene oxide sterilizers to the 12/88 ethylene oxide gas sterilizer. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 1996;17:92–100. doi: 10.1086/647252.
25. Rutala WA, 1994, 1995, and 1996 APIC Guidelines Committee APIC guideline for selection and use of disinfectants. Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, Inc. Am J Infect Control. 1996;24:313–342. doi: 10.1016/s0196-6553(96)90066-8.
26. Block SS, editor. Disinfection, Sterilization, and Preservation. 5th ed. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; Philadelphia: 2001.
27. Foliente RL, Kovacs BJ, Aprecio RM. Efficacy of high-level disinfectants for reprocessing gastrointestinal endoscopes in simulated-use testing. Gastrointest Endosc. 2001;53:456–462. doi: 10.1067/mge.2001.113380.
28. Spaulding EH. Chemical disinfection of medical and surgical materials. In: Lawrence C, Block SS, editors. Disinfection, Sterilization, and Preservation. Lea & Febiger; Philadelphia: 1968. pp. 517–531.
29. Rutala WA, Weber DJ, Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee Guideline for Disinfection and Sterilization in Healthcare Facilities. 2008.
30. Huslage K, Rutala WA, Sickbert-Bennett E. A quantitative approach to defining high-touch surfaces in hospitals. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2010;31:850–853.
31. Sattar SA, Lloyd-Evans N, Springthorpe VS. Institutional outbreaks of rotavirus diarrhoea: potential role of fomites and environmental surfaces as vehicles for virus transmission. J Hyg. 1986;96:277–289.
32. Weber DJ, Rutala WA. Environmental issues and nosocomial infections. In: Wenzel RP, editor. Prevention and Control of Nosocomial Infections. 3rd ed. Williams & Wilkins; Baltimore: 1997. pp. 491–514.
33. Kovacs BJ, Chen YK, Kettering JD. High-level disinfection of gastrointestinal endoscopes: are current guidelines adequate? Am J Gastroenterol. 1999;94:1546–1550.
34. Gerding DN, Peterson LR, Vennes JA. Cleaning and disinfection of fiberoptic endoscopes: evaluation of glutaraldehyde exposure time and forced-air drying. Gastroenterology. 1982;83:613–618.

35. Rutala WA, Clontz EP, Weber DJ. Disinfection practices for endoscopes and other semicritical items. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 1991;12:282–288.
36. Wallace RJ, Jr, Brown BA, Griffith DE. Nosocomial outbreaks/pseudo-outbreaks caused by nontuberculous mycobacteria. Annu Rev Microbiol. 1998;52:453–490.
37. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Guidelines for environmental infection control in health-care facilities, 2003. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2003;52(RR-10):1–44.
38. Sattar SA, Jacobsen H, Springthorpe VS. Chemical disinfection to interrupt transfer of rhinovirus type 14 from environmental surfaces to hands. Appl Environ Microbiol. 1993;59:1579–1585.
39. Meenhorst PL, Reingold AL, Groothuis DG. Water-related nosocomial pneumonia caused by Legionella pneumophila serogroups 1 and 10. J Infect Dis. 1985;152:356–364.
40. Rutala WA, Weber DJ. Water as a reservoir of nosocomial pathogens. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 1997;18:609–616.
41. Petersen BT, Chennat J, Cohen J. Multisociety guideline on reprocessing flexible GI endoscopes: 2011. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2011;32:527–537.
42. Atlas RM. Legionella: from environmental habitats to disease pathology, detection and control. Environ Microbiol. 1999;1:283–293.
43. Ward RL, Bernstein DI, Knowlton DR. Prevention of surface-to-human transmission of rotaviruses by treatment with disinfectant spray. J Clin Microbiol. 1991;29:1991–1996.
44. Weber DJ, Rutala WA. Role of environmental contamination in the transmission of vancomycin-resistant enterococci. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 1997;18:306–309.
45. Rutala WA, Gergen MF, Weber DJ. Microbiologic evaluation of microfiber mops for surface disinfection. Am J Infect Control. 2007;35:569–573.
46. Pentella MA, Fisher T, Chandler S. Are disinfectants accurately prepared for use in hospital patient care areas? Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2000;21:103.
47. Jeong EK, Bae JE, Kim IS. Inactivation of influenza A virus H1N1 by disinfection process. Am J Infect Control. 2010;38:354–360.
48. Gwaltney JM, Jr, Hendley JO. Transmission of experimental rhinovirus infection by contaminated surfaces. Am J Epidemiol. 1982;116:828–833.
49. Best M, Springthorpe VS, Sattar SA. Feasibility of a combined carrier test for disinfectants: studies with a mixture of five types of microorganisms. Am J Infect Control. 1994;22:152–162.
50. Ciesek S, Friesland M, Steinmann J. How stable is the hepatitis C virus (HCV)? Environmental stability of HCV and its susceptibility to chemical biocides. J Infect Dis. 2010;201:1859–1866.
51. Best M, Sattar SA, Springthorpe VS. Efficacies of selected disinfectants against Mycobacterium tuberculosis. J Clin Microbiol. 1990;28:2234–2239.
52. Springthorpe VS, Grenier JL, Lloyd-Evans N. Chemical disinfection of human rotaviruses: efficacy of commercially-available products in suspension tests. J Hyg. 1986;97:139–161.
53. Rutala WA, Gergen MF, Weber DJ. Efficacy of improved hydrogen peroxide against important healthcare-associated pathogens. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2012;33:1159–1161