

ASX RELEASE**28 July 2021****ASX: NVU**

Nestle Research validates Nanoshield with SARS-CoV-2 testing

Highlights:

- **A study conducted by Nestle Research over a combined period of five months has concluded Nanoveu's Nanoshield product to be highly effective against the SARS-CoV-2 virus that causes COVID-19**
- **The clinical testing has been published in the Applied and Environmental Microbiology journal**
- **>4.0 Log₁₀ reduction of SARS-CoV-2 (>99.99% inactivation¹) achieved at time-stamp '0' (15 minutes drying/contact time)**
- **Assessment was conducted by researchers from Nestlé Research, Institute of Food Safety and Analytical Science at a BSL-3 facility under high-security conditions**
- **Research assessed three key criteria simulating real-world conditions: immediate antiviral activity, long-term activity/durability after repeated cleaning and the effect of frequent touching**
- **Results confirm Nanoshield's status as a globally significant product with ability to make surfaces safer**

Nanoveu Limited ("Nanoveu" or the "Company") is pleased to announce its Nanoshield antiviral protection technology has received highly successful results in an assessment of its efficacy against SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19).

The study, which was conducted by researchers from Nestlé Research, Institute of Food Safety and Analytical Science was published in the Applied and Environmental Microbiology journal (DOI: 10.1128/AEM.01098-21) and is available for public access:

<https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AEM.01098-21>

The report is appended to this announcement.

Assessment was conducted under a modified ISO 21702 protocol which has been designed to fill a gap in research knowledge regarding the efficacy of commercially available self-disinfecting surfaces under real-life conditions. The protocol was also required to be carried out in a biosafety

¹ The higher logarithmic reduction, the higher percentage of viral load is inactivated. For example; 1 Log₁₀ = 90% reduction, 2 Log₁₀ = 99% reduction, 3 Log₁₀ = 99.9% reduction, 4 Log₁₀ = 99.99% reduction. In Australia, the TGA requires product demonstrate at least a 4 Log₁₀ against specific viruses to claim effectiveness.

level 3 (BSL-3) facility equipped with significant safety resources, sufficient to permit research on the novel coronavirus.

The results demonstrate Nanoshield was effective at reducing SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) immediately, in durability testing and also effective despite the presence of other organic matter.

Commenting on the ground-breaking result Nanoveu Executive Chairman and CEO Alfred Chong said:

“We have long believed the importance of scientific research in the efficacy of our products, and we welcome the validation of our antiviral claims as the leading antiviral coatings for high touch surfaces.

“Many businesses and government agencies have been looking to science to address the challenges of “living with COVID” as the pandemic rages through countries.

“Nanoveu’s copper-based technology has demonstrated to be highly effective in a number of real-world scenarios, outperforming other products including quaternary ammonium compounds which lose their efficiency in the normal course of cleaning, and reactive oxygen species which are found not to be effective in everyday environments.

“Our robust network of suppliers, fabrication and manufacturing partners and testing agencies have ensured that we have a solid business-case for our clients looking for additional measure to mitigate the risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission from high-touch surface.

“Now that the scientific research has been reviewed and published, Nanoshield becomes one of the most economical options to deliver protection and peace of mind. We are grateful to Nestlé Professional Group and their research laboratories for sharing this important finding. They are a fantastic example of a global brand which – once aware of the results – employed the Nanoshield product offering across their network. From a marketing perspective, the research also allows us and our distribution partners to directly address customer’s main concern – that of protecting staff, customers and other partners from COVID-19.

“The testing of our products by Nestle’s Class 3 laboratories and qualified scientists specifically against SARS-CoV-2 virus is a major achievement and without the assistance of our flagship customer Nestlé Professional, the exercise would have been prohibitively expensive and time consuming. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Nestlé Professional as well as Nanoveu shareholders for their support as we now prepare for the next phase of growth.”

Assessment conditions and results

The testing analysed the effectiveness of Nanoveu’s Nanoshield product and two other products under a number of conditions.

Nestle Research cite a lack of solid scientific evidence surrounding commercially available self-disinfecting surface coatings under conditions that mimic real-world use. They developed a novel, robust approach to evaluate the antiviral activity of such coatings, applying three criteria:

1. Immediate antiviral activity;
2. Effect after repeated cleaning of the coated surface; and
3. Antiviral activity in the presence of organic material (frequent touching).

Base-case test conditions saw the three commercially available products assessed against SARS-CoV-2 and human coronavirus HCoV-229E by placing the virus on coated and un-coated 25cm² surfaces.

The viral sample was dried upon the surfaces at room temperature for 15 minutes and subsequently assessed at the 0, 30 and 120 minute-mark. Short evaluation periods were chosen to reflect real-world use cases where antiviral activity needs to occur within a rapid timeframe.

In addition to base-case assessment, the test subjects were also analysed after repeated cleaning with the surfaces being wiped by a microfibre cloth 1, 7, 30 and 90 times over five days at room temperature.

The assumption of the repeated cleaning scenario is that one cleaning per day is a standard procedure for many high-touch surfaces. The various wiping frequencies can then be used to assess product effectiveness after simulating the amount of cleaning received at one day, one week, one month and three-month intervals.

Finally, the assessment also sought to understand the level of effectiveness while also hosting organic material introduced by finger-touching.

Prior to applying the viral load, the surfaces were touched by a finger 10 and 50 times, to simulate medium and high levels of daily touching.

In the assessment of antiviral activity after repeated cleaning the Nanoveu product performed exceptionally well, demonstrating antiviral activity following all rounds of cleaning. The QAC-based coating was removed after only one round of cleaning, limiting its effectiveness in this assessment.

The Nanoshield product was then assessed for effectiveness on a surface which has been subjected to human touching.

After 10 touches, the product returned strong results, with greater than 4.0 log₁₀ reduction (99.99% inactivation) of HCoV-299E and 3.2 log₁₀ reduction (>99.9% inactivation) of SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19).

After 50 touches the product was still able to inactivate >90% of both coronaviruses at time stamp '0' (1.4 log₁₀ reduction of HCoV-299E and 1.3 log₁₀ reduction of SARS-CoV-2).

The results demonstrate that even under a high-use scenario the product retains its antiviral properties. However, for best performance a daily clean is recommended.

In addition to SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) and HCoV-299E, Nanoveu's antiviral technology has been independently demonstrated to be a highly effective agent for the inactivation of other viruses. The technology has been proven to eliminate 99.99%² of OC43, another coronavirus affecting humans in 30 minutes. The antiviral protection has also been validated against other bacteria and viruses including E. coli, Influenza A (subtype H3N2), and coronavirus MHV-A59³. Additionally, testing simulating 12 months outdoor weather exposure has found Nanoveu's products retain their effectiveness against MS2 Bacteriophage, a single-strand RNA virus⁴.

- Ends -

This announcement has been authorised for release by Nanoveu's Executive Chairman and CEO.

² See announcements of 5 and 25 May 2020

³ See announcement of 15 April 2020

⁴ See ASX announcement of 18 February 2021

For further information, please contact:

Alfred Chong
Executive Chairman and CEO

t: +65 6557 0155
e: info@nanoveu.com

For media / investor enquiries, please contact:

David Tasker / Alex Baker
Chapter One Advisors

t: + 61 433 112 936 / +61 432 801 745
e: dtasker@chapteroneadvisors.com.au

About Nanoveu's Products:

Nanoshield is a film which uses a patented polymer of Cuprous embedded film to self-disinfect surfaces. Nanoshield antiviral protection which is available in a variety of shapes and forms, from mobile phone screen covers, to mobile phone cases and as a PVC commercial film, capable of being applied to a number of surfaces such as doorhandles and push panels. The perfectly clear plastic film contains a layer of charged copper nanoparticles which have antiviral and antimicrobial properties.

EyeFly3D is a film applied to digital displays that allowed users to experience 3D without the need for glasses on everyday mobile handheld devices.

Customskins are vending machines capable of precisely applying screen covers to mobile phones with an alignment accuracy of 150 microns.

Currently in research and development stage, EyeFyx is a vision correction solution using hardware and software to manipulate screen output addressing long-sightedness without the need to wear reading glasses.

22 measure to mitigate the risk of transmission of respiratory viruses such as SARS-CoV-2 or
23 influenza viruses from high-touch surfaces.

24

25 **Importance**

26 SARS-CoV-2, the virus responsible for the COVID-19 pandemic, is transmitted mainly by
27 person-to-person through respiratory droplets whilst the contribution of fomite transmission is
28 less important than suspected at the beginning of the pandemic. Nevertheless, antiviral coating
29 solutions can offer an additional measure to mitigate the risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission from
30 high-touch surfaces. The deployment of antiviral coatings is not new, but what is currently
31 lacking is solid scientific evidence of the efficacy of commercially available self-disinfecting
32 surfaces under real-life conditions. Therefore, we developed a novel, robust approach to evaluate
33 the antiviral activity of such coatings, applying strict quality criteria to three commercially
34 available products to test their efficacy against SARS-CoV-2. We also showed that HCoV-229E
35 is a relevant surrogate for such experiments. Our approach will bring significant benefit to
36 evaluate the effect of coatings also on the survival of non-enveloped viruses, known to be more
37 tolerant to desiccation and disinfectants and for which high-touch surfaces play an important
38 role.

39

40 **Introduction**

41 The first reported cases of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)
42 pneumonia occurred in Wuhan, Hubei Province, China, in December 2019 and January 2020 (1,
43 2), and rapidly developed into the COVID-19 worldwide pandemic (3). The main transmission

44 route of SARS-CoV-2 is human-to-human by close contact through respiratory droplets and
45 possibly aerosols (4). The persistence of infectious SARS-CoV-2 was shown to be high, up to 4
46 days, on various surfaces, such as stainless steel, plastic and glass, with infectivity better
47 preserved in the presence of proteins (5, 6). Surfaces in hospital and community settings have
48 been shown to be widely contaminated by SARS-CoV-2 RNA (7-9). SARS-CoV-2, other
49 coronaviruses, such as human coronavirus HCoV-229E, or influenza viruses are efficiently and
50 rapidly inactivated by alcohol solutions and disinfectants used for routine cleaning and sanitation
51 (10-13), but chemical disinfectants are relatively short lived, for example in the case of alcohol
52 due to evaporation. As an additional measure to the cleaning regime, antiviral coatings can
53 contribute to the hygiene of high-touch surfaces. Modification and/or functionalization of
54 surfaces (sometimes called “self-disinfecting surfaces” or coatings) to quickly inactivate
55 microorganisms upon contact is a highly relevant research area (14-16).

56 A number of commercially available coatings advertise antiviral properties, however laboratory
57 evidence demonstrating efficacy is mostly lacking. A robust methodology that mimics real-life
58 conditions is urgently needed to evaluate antiviral claims of such products.

59 In this study, we provide a new approach comprised of three criteria to evaluate the antiviral
60 potential of a surface coating, namely (i) immediate antiviral activity, (ii) antiviral activity of the
61 coating after repeated cleaning, and (iii) the effect of organic material deposited by finger-
62 contact on the antiviral activity of the coating. We tested the approach with SARS-CoV-2 and
63 HCoV-229E as potential surrogate using three available commercial products claiming antiviral
64 effects based on distinct effector mechanisms, i.e. reactive oxygen species (ROS), copper
65 compounds, and quaternary ammonium compounds (QACs).

66

67 **Results and Discussion**

68 A systematic approach to evaluate the antimicrobial activity of coatings is currently lacking (17).
69 Standards such as the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) Method E1153 (18)
70 and ISO 21702 (19) to assess the antiviral activity on nonporous surfaces only consider the
71 immediate antiviral activity which is insufficient, hence our objective to develop a testing
72 protocol with additional and meaningful hurdles that closely reflect real-life surface exposure.
73 We developed a comprehensive approach using three criteria to evaluate the antiviral potential of
74 different surface coatings. First a protocol was established to evaluate the immediate antiviral
75 activity, based on the experimental set-up of the ISO 21702, with modifications to better
76 represent real-life settings (19). The most important modification was to air-dry the inoculum 15
77 minutes instead of covering it with a cover film which keeps it wet. This allowed for
78 consideration of potential viral inactivation due to simple drying on the surface, as moisture of a
79 droplet will in most cases have evaporated when the next person touches the surface. The second
80 modification was that the contact times were shortened from 24 hours to 0, 30 or 120 minutes.
81 Indeed, an antiviral coating is only efficient if it reduces the viral load quickly, as there is
82 potentially only a very short interval between users of high-touch surfaces. In addition to the
83 immediate antiviral activity, two other key aspects were included in the evaluation, namely the
84 robustness towards cleaning, and the inherent capacity of the coating to work despite the
85 presence of organic material.

86 **Immediate antiviral activity.** The immediate antiviral activity of the three coatings was
87 evaluated by comparing the survival of the HCoV-229E, on non-coated versus coated surfaces
88 for each contact time (0, 30 or 120 minutes) at room temperature (Figure 1). At time 0
89 (corresponding to 15 minutes drying after spiking of the virus on the surfaces), no reduction of

90 HCoV-229E was obtained with the coating based on ROS (Figure 1A), whereas the coatings
91 based on copper compounds and on QACs inactivated HCoV-229E by more than 3.5 and 2.0
92 \log_{10} , respectively (Figures 1B and 1C). At times 30 and 120 minutes, the ROS-based coating
93 showed low ($0.6 \log_{10}$) and no antiviral activity, respectively (Figure 1A). The ROS-based
94 coating, when activated by light, forms ROS with the moisture in the air. It is possible that we
95 did not observe viral inactivation because no ROS were formed, or the ROS did not affect
96 HCoV-229E within the time span of two hours. Another study using TiO_2 -coated glass observed
97 more than 3 \log_{10} reduction of influenza virus, but only after 4 hours of UV-A exposure (20).
98 Based on the results obtained with HCoV-229E, the ROS-based coating was not investigated any
99 further.

100 The two coatings which showed immediate antiviral activity against HCoV-229E were evaluated
101 for antiviral activity using SARS-CoV-2 after 0, 30 or 120 minutes of contact times at room
102 temperature (Figures 1B and 1C). At time 0, a reduction of more than 4.0 \log_{10} and more than 1.6
103 \log_{10} of SARS-CoV-2 was observed on the copper compound-based and the QAC-based
104 coatings, respectively (Figures 1B and 1C).

105 The antiviral effect of copper has previously been reported for HCoV-229E and SARS-CoV-2
106 (21, 22). The antiviral activity of the copper compound-based coating used in our study is
107 thought to be caused by contact between the surfaces of the virus and the copper compound,
108 causing denaturation of biomolecules (e.g. proteins) which results in viral inactivation.
109 Comparable viral inactivation was described previously where a 30-minute exposure to Cu_2O ,
110 another copper compound, lead to a reduction of more than 5 \log_{10} of bacteriophage Q β , a small
111 sized single stranded RNA virus (23). The mechanism of the QAC-based coating technology is
112 based on positively charged quaternized nitrogen and carbon chain “spikes”. The negatively

113 charged microbial cell wall of bacteria is attracted to the “spikes” and consequently disrupted,
114 leading to inactivation. The antiviral activity we observed may be the result of a similar
115 mechanism, since SARS-CoV-2 virus particles are mostly negatively charged at neutral pH (24).
116 QACs coated on glass were also shown to be effective against influenza virus (25). It is
117 important to mention that we observed an immediate antiviral activity only if the QAC-based
118 coating was applied by spraying without subsequent wiping. No immediate antiviral activity was
119 observed when the coating was sprayed on the surface directly followed by wiping to evenly
120 distribute the product on the surface (data not shown).

121 **Antiviral activity after repeated cleaning.** The antiviral activity of the coating based on copper
122 compounds and QACs was evaluated by cleaning the surfaces 1, 7, 30 or 90 times using a
123 microfiber cloth with a water-based detergent. This represents an accelerated protocol to
124 simulate 1, 7, 30 or 90 rounds of cleaning. The antiviral activity was assessed by comparing the
125 survival of HCoV-229E and SARS-CoV-2 on non-coated surfaces versus coated and cleaned
126 surfaces (Figure 2). The antiviral activity of the copper compound-based coating remained intact
127 for at least 90 rounds of cleaning (Figure 2A), whereas the antiviral activity of the QAC-based
128 coating was removed after only one round of cleaning (Figure 2B). The coating sprayed on the
129 surface was probably wiped off during cleaning. This is similar to the results from a controlled
130 trial in a hospital setting and shows that the mode of application of a spray coating is pivotal and
131 potentially less reliable compared to a ready-to-use adhesive film (26). Similar to the cleaning,
132 disinfection with 70% ethanol did not affect the antiviral efficiency of the copper compound-
133 based coating whereas the antiviral activity was lost for the QAC-based coating (Figure 3).
134 These study results are necessary to define cleaning instructions (e.g. type of cloth and
135 frequency) for the applied coating to ensure sustained antiviral activity.

136 **Effect of organic material introduced by finger-touching.** The copper compound-based
137 coating successfully passed the two first criteria and was further evaluated for the third criterion.
138 To assess this criterion, coated surfaces were finger-touched 10 or 50 times, prior to virus
139 inoculation, to simulate the daily use of a high touch surface (e.g touch screens of vending
140 machines). This experimental set-up allowed to evaluate the effect of organic material such as
141 fingermark residues on antiviral activity. The antiviral activity was assessed by comparing the
142 survival of HCoV-229E and SARS-CoV-2 on non-coated versus coated and touched surfaces
143 (Figure 4). The antiviral activity of the copper compound-based coating was still high after 10
144 touches ($> 4.0 \log_{10}$ reduction of HCoV-229E and $3.2 \log_{10}$ reduction of SARS-CoV-2), but
145 lower after 50 touches ($1.4 \log_{10}$ reduction of HCoV-229E and $1.3 \log_{10}$ reduction of SARS-
146 CoV-2). Similar \log_{10} reductions were obtained for HCoV-229E and SARS-CoV-2 after 50-
147 times finger-touching (p-value of 0.83). Fifty touches correspond to a daily touching frequency
148 of a highly used vending machine and shows that the copper compound-based coating may retain
149 activity for roughly one day. Afterwards, cleaning is required to remove traces of organic
150 material. Repeated cleaning with a microfiber cloth did not affect the antiviral activity as shown
151 when the second criterion was evaluated (Figure 2A). The commercial copper compound-based
152 coating fulfilled the three evaluation criteria and can be considered an efficient antiviral coating.

153 **Comparison of HCoV-229E and SARS-CoV-2.** This study assessed the antiviral activity of
154 coatings using two viruses, HCoV-229E and SARS-CoV-2. Both viruses are human respiratory
155 pathogens. They belong to the family *Coronaviridae* with a single-strand, positive-sense RNA
156 genome approximately 26-32 kilobases in size and a similar structure with spike projections
157 from the virus membrane (27, 28). Despite these similarities, HCoV-229E cannot serve as a
158 legitimate surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 without comparison and calibration (29). Since the LOQ

159 was reached, the maximum \log_{10} reduction was obtained for both viruses when testing the
160 immediate antiviral activity, the first criterion, of the copper compound and QAC-based
161 coatings. The maximum \log_{10} reduction was also observed for both viruses on the copper
162 compound-based coating after repeated cleaning (second criterion). No \log_{10} reduction was
163 observed for both viruses on the QAC-based coating after repeated cleaning. The evaluation of
164 the effect of organic material introduced by the finger-touching in the third criterion also showed
165 a similar behavior of SARS-CoV-2 and HCoV-229E. After 50 finger touches, the LOQ was not
166 reached allowing for calculation of the p-value ($p\text{-value} = 0.83$) which indicated that the \log_{10}
167 reductions obtained for both viruses were not significantly different. Together these results show
168 that both viruses behaved similarly in all experiments representing the three evaluation criteria
169 (immediate antiviral activity, antiviral activity after repeated cleaning and the effect of organic
170 material introduced by finger-touching), demonstrating that HCoV-229E is a relevant SARS-
171 CoV-2 surrogate for the evaluation of these surface coating products. Generating data with
172 human coronavirus surrogates, that can be handled in biosafety level (BSL)-2 laboratories is
173 important, as studies with SARS-CoV-2 must be conducted in BSL-3 facilities, limiting the
174 number of laboratories available.

175 In conclusion, a harmonized protocol will allow regulators and users to evaluate claims related to
176 antiviral surfaces. It would be of interest to further elucidate the mode of action of these surfaces,
177 especially when in contact with organic material and when exposed to extreme temperatures and
178 pH conditions. It will also be useful to benchmark currently available coatings against novel
179 technical solutions. Microbial tolerance to biocidal compounds present in coatings is unlikely
180 due to the multitarget nature or non-specific action of the chemicals used, as described for QACs

181 (30). The coated surfaces will be regularly cleaned, thus avoiding long-term exposure and
182 potential microbial tolerance to these biocidal compounds.

183 In the future our approach to evaluate and verify the antiviral activity of coatings could be
184 expanded to also encompass the effect on non-enveloped viruses, known to be more tolerant to
185 desiccation and disinfectants, such as Noroviruses, which are transmitted by the fecal-oral route
186 and for which high-touch surfaces play an important role.

187

188 **Materials and Methods**

189 **Virus and preparation of suspension.** HCoV-229E (ATCC VR-740) and SARS-CoV-2, kindly
190 provided by Prof. Isabella Eckerle (Geneva University Hospitals, Center for Emerging Viral
191 Diseases), were propagated, assayed and titrated on human lung fibroblast MRC-5 cells (ATCC
192 CCL-171) and on kidney African Green Monkey Vero C1008 [Vero 76, clone E6, Vero E6]
193 (ECACC 85020206) cells, respectively, as described previously for enteric viruses (31). Briefly,
194 the cells were passaged in Eagle's Minimum Essential Medium (EMEM) (ATCC, 30-2003)
195 supplemented with 10% Fetal Bovine Serum (FBS) (ATCC, 30-2020) and 1%
196 Penicillin/Streptomycin 100 X (Sigma, P0781) followed by incubation at 37°C with 5% CO₂.
197 Viruses were propagated on their respective host cells followed by incubation at 35°C with 5%
198 CO₂ for 1 to 2 h to allow the adsorption of the viruses to the cells. The adsorption was stopped
199 by adding 25 ml of EMEM supplemented with 2% FBS and 1% Penicillin/Streptomycin 100 X
200 followed by incubation at 35°C with 5% CO₂. Viral stocks were purified and concentrated by a
201 polyethylene glycol precipitation (0.25 volume of 5x polyethylene glycol/NaCl solution) as
202 described in ISO-15216 (32). The pellets were resuspended in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS)

(Sigma, D8662). Viral titers determined as the 50% tissue culture infective dose (TCID₅₀) per milliliter as described previously (31), were $7.0 \pm 0.3 \log_{10}$ TCID₅₀/ml for SARS-CoV-2 and ranged from $6.5 \pm 0.1 \log_{10}$ TCID₅₀/ml to $7.0 \pm 0.1 \log_{10}$ TCID₅₀/ml for HCoV-229E.

Antiviral coating solutions. ROS-based coated (the type of ROS is not described by the supplier) and non-coated 25 cm² glass surfaces, copper compound-based coated and non-coated 25 cm² polyethylene terephthalate (PET) films and QAC-based spray were kindly provided by the suppliers and are commercially available as Kastus glass cover commercialized by Kastus (Dublin, Ireland), Nanoshield commercialized by Nanoveu Limited (Subiaco, Australia) and Zoono Microbe Shield (Z-71) spray commercialized by Zoono group (Auckland, New Zealand), respectively. The ROS-based glass and the copper compound-based PET films are ready to employ coatings to be applied like a phone screen protector. The ROS-based coating forms ROS with the moisture in the air when activated by light. The QAC-based coating needs to be sprayed on the surface of interest by the customer. In our study, this coating was sprayed on 25 cm² poly-methyl methacrylate surfaces and distributed on the whole surface using the side of a micropipette tip followed by drying in a biosafety cabinet for at least 10 min.

Evaluation of the antiviral activity. The experimental set up was based on the ISO 21702 method (19) with slight modifications. The inoculum was dried for 15 minutes instead of covering it with a cover film which keeps it wet and the contact times were shortened from 24 hours to 0, 30 and 120 minutes, as the antiviral activity needs to act fast for high-touch surfaces to ensure inactivation between users.

Immediate antiviral activity. The immediate antiviral activity against HCoV-229E and SARS-CoV-2 was evaluated by comparing the survival of the viruses on non-coated surfaces and coated surfaces after 0, 30 or 120 minutes of contact times at room temperature.

226 Antiviral activity after repeated cleaning. The antiviral activity against HCoV-229E and SARS-
227 CoV-2 was evaluated by comparing the survival of the viruses on non-coated surfaces versus
228 coated surfaces previously cleaned 1, 7, 30 or 90 times using a microfiber cloth over 5 days at
229 room temperature. As one cleaning per day is a standard procedure for many high-touch
230 surfaces, this protocol simulates one day, one week, one month and three months of cleaning,
231 respectively. Cleaning was carried out with Suma Star D1 detergent (10-20% sodium
232 dodecylbenzene sulfonate, 5-10% sodium lauryl ether sulfate, 1-3% ethyl alcohol) according to
233 the supplier recommendations (Diversey Europe, Münschwilen, Switzerland) or 70% ethanol for
234 disinfection.

235 Organic material effect introduced by finger-touching. The antiviral activity against HCoV-229E
236 and SARS-CoV-2 was determined by comparing the survival of the viruses on non-coated
237 surfaces versus coated surfaces finger-touched 0, 10 or 50 times by 10 volunteers, meaning 0, 1
238 or 5 finger-touching per person per 25 cm², respectively. This corresponds to a medium (10) and
239 high (50) daily touching frequency of a high-touch surface. The volunteers were asked to not
240 wash or disinfect their hands prior to the finger-touching. Each finger-touching was performed
241 using 3 fingers applied several times on the surface in order to cover the 25 cm².

242 **Virus inoculation on coated and non-coated surfaces.** One hundred µl of HCoV-229E (5.5 or
243 6.0 log₁₀ TCID₅₀) or SARS-CoV-2 (6.0 log₁₀ TCID₅₀) which corresponds to viral loads in saliva
244 of infected patients (33, 34) was spread on a 25 cm² non-coated or coated surface and dried for
245 15 minutes in a biosafety cabinet at room temperature. According to visual inspection, 15
246 minutes was the minimum time required to have a dry inoculum on the different surfaces
247 employed in this study.

248 **Virus recovery from non-coated and coated surfaces.** Viruses were recovered by intensively
249 swabbing the surface using a cotton-tipped swab (VWR, 115-1881) pre-dipped in Dey-Engley
250 Neutralizing broth (Sigma, D3435) 5-fold diluted in PBS (Sigma, D8537). The swab was
251 transferred to a 1.5-ml tube containing 0.5 ml of Dey-Engley Neutralizing broth 5-fold diluted in
252 PBS. The plastic part of the swab was cut in order to close the tube and the tube was vortexed
253 vigorously for 1 minute to release the viruses. The recovered viruses were 5-fold serially diluted
254 and enumerated by determining the TCID₅₀ (31). Preliminary experiments demonstrated that
255 Dey-Engley Neutralizing both 5-fold diluted did not affect the enumeration of the viruses.

256 **Data analysis.** Viral counts (N_x and N_0) were expressed in \log_{10} TCID₅₀/25 cm² where N_x is the
257 viral titer recovered from the coated surface and N_0 the titer recovered from the non-coated
258 surface (mean of 3 replicates). Plotted values are mean viral count \pm standard deviation. The
259 limit of quantification (LOQ) of the method was $1.05 \log_{10}$ TCID₅₀/25 cm². Nevertheless, in
260 some cases the LOQ was coating dependent since cytotoxicity on the cells was observed. The
261 cytotoxicity induced by the coating solutions was evaluated by swabbing 25 cm² coated surface
262 (not inoculated with viruses) and analyzed as described above (virus recovery from non-coated
263 and coated surfaces) and inoculated on MRC-5 and Vero C-1008 cell lines. Each condition was
264 tested in triplicate. The copper compound-based coating did not induce cytotoxicity and the LOQ
265 for both viruses was $1.05 \log_{10}$ TCID₅₀/25 cm², whereas the QAC-based coating induced
266 cytotoxicity on the two cell lines increasing the LOQ for both viruses to $3.15 \log_{10}$ TCID₅₀/25
267 cm². Values below the LOQ were entered as LOQ with an asterisk in the graphs. Reduction in
268 infectious virus count (inactivation) was calculated as N_x/N_0 and expressed in \log_{10} . The
269 statistical significance of \log_{10} reductions of HCoV-229E and SARS-CoV-2 obtained with the
270 copper compound-based coating after 50 finger touches (Figure 4) was performed by a two-

271 sampled *t*-test (unequal variance) using Microsoft Excel® for Microsoft 365 MSO. P-values
272 below 0.05 were considered as significantly different.

273

274 **Acknowledgements**

275 We thank Prof. Isabella Eckerle (Geneva University Hospitals, Center for Emerging Viral
276 Diseases, Switzerland) for the provision of the SARS-CoV-2 virus lysate. We thank Harald
277 Brüssow (KU Leuven, Division Animal and Human Health Engineering, Belgium), Richard
278 Stadler, Benoit Schilter, John Donaghy, Paul Eichler (Nestlé, Switzerland) for the critical review
279 of the manuscript.

280

281 **Competing interests**

282 The authors declare no competing interests.

283

284 **References**

- 285 1. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, Ren R, Leung KSM, Lau EHY, Wong
286 JY, Xing X, Xiang N, Wu Y, Li C, Chen Q, Li D, Liu T, Zhao J, Liu M, Tu W, Chen C,
287 Jin L, Yang R, Wang Q, Zhou S, Wang R, Liu H, Luo Y, Liu Y, Shao G, Li H, Tao Z,
288 Yang Y, Deng Z, Liu B, Ma Z, Zhang Y, Shi G, Lam TTY, Wu JT, Gao GF, Cowling BJ,
289 Yang B, Leung GM, Feng Z. 2020. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of
290 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med* 382:1199-1207.

- 291 2. Zhou P, Yang X-L, Wang X-G, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W, Si H-R, Zhu Y, Li B, Huang
292 C-L, Chen H-D, Chen J, Luo Y, Guo H, Jiang R-D, Liu M-Q, Chen Y, Shen X-R, Wang
293 X, Zheng X-S, Zhao K, Chen Q-J, Deng F, Liu L-L, Yan B, Zhan F-X, Wang Y-Y, Xiao
294 G-F, Shi Z-L. 2020. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of
295 probable bat origin. *Nature* 579:270-273.
- 296 3. WHO. 2021. [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports)
297 2019/situation-reports. Accessed on February 16th, 2021.
- 298 4. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ. 2020. Physical
299 distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of
300 SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*
301 doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)31142-9.
- 302 5. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN,
303 Tamin A, Harcourt JL, Thornburg NJ, Gerber SI, Lloyd-Smith JO, de Wit E, Munster VJ.
304 2020. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N*
305 *Engl J Med* 382:1564-1567.
- 306 6. Pastorino B, Touret F, Gilles M, de Lamballerie X, Charrel R. 2020. Prolonged
307 Infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 in Fomites. *Emerging Infectious Disease journal* 26.
- 308 7. Guo ZD, Wang ZY, Zhang SF, Li X, Li L, Li C, Cui Y, Fu RB, Dong YZ, Chi XY,
309 Zhang MY, Liu K, Cao C, Liu B, Zhang K, Gao YW, Lu B, Chen W. 2020. Aerosol and
310 Surface Distribution of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Hospital
311 Wards, Wuhan, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* 26.
- 312 8. Ma J, Qi X, Chen H, Li X, Zhan Z, Wang H, Sun L, Zhang L, Guo J, Morawska L,
313 Grinshpun SA, Biswas P, Flagan RC, Yao M. 2020. Exhaled breath is a significant

- 314 source of SARS-CoV-2 emission. medRxiv
315 doi:10.1101/2020.05.31.20115154:2020.05.31.20115154.
- 316 9. Harvey AP, Fuhrmeister ER, Cantrell M, Pitol AK, Swarthout JM, Powers JE,
317 Nadimpalli ML, Julian TR, Pickering AJ. 2020. Longitudinal monitoring of SARS-CoV-
318 2 RNA on high-touch surfaces in a community setting. medRxiv
319 doi:10.1101/2020.10.27.20220905.
- 320 10. Kratzel A, Todt D, V'Kovski P, Steiner S, Gultom M, Thao TTN, Ebert N, Holwerda M,
321 Steinmann J, Niemeyer D, Dijkman R, Kampf G, Drosten C, Steinmann E, Thiel V,
322 Pfaender S. 2020. Inactivation of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 by
323 WHO-Recommended Hand Rub Formulations and Alcohols. *Emerg Infect Dis* 26.
- 324 11. Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY, Lee TH, Ng OT, Wong MSY, Marimuthu K. 2020. Air,
325 Surface Environmental, and Personal Protective Equipment Contamination by Severe
326 Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) From a Symptomatic
327 Patient. *Jama* 323:1610-2.
- 328 12. Kampf G, Todt D, Pfaender S, Steinmann E. 2020. Persistence of coronaviruses on
329 inanimate surfaces and their inactivation with biocidal agents. *J Hosp Infect* 104:246-251.
- 330 13. De Benedictis P, Beato MS, Capua I. 2007. Inactivation of Avian Influenza Viruses by
331 Chemical Agents and Physical Conditions: A Review. *Zoonoses and Public Health*
332 54:51-68.
- 333 14. Weber DJ, Rutala WA. 2013. Self-disinfecting surfaces: review of current methodologies
334 and future prospects. *Am J Infect Control* 41:S31-5.
- 335 15. Tripathy A, Sen P, Su B, Briscoe WH. 2017. Natural and bioinspired nanostructured
336 bactericidal surfaces. *Adv Colloid Interface Sci* 248:85-104.

- 337 16. Querido MM, Aguiar L, Neves P, Pereira CC, Teixeira JP. 2019. Self-disinfecting
338 surfaces and infection control. *Colloids Surf B Biointerfaces* 178:8-21.
- 339 17. Imani SM, Ladouceur L, Marshall T, Maclachlan R, Soleymani L, Didar TF. 2020.
340 Antimicrobial Nanomaterials and Coatings: Current Mechanisms and Future Perspectives
341 to Control the Spread of Viruses Including SARS-CoV-2. *ACS Nano* 14:12341-12369.
- 342 18. ASTM. 2011. ASTM E1053-11, Standard Test Method to Assess Virucidal Activity of
343 Chemicals Intended for Disinfection of Inanimate, Nonporous Environmental Surfaces,
344 ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA, 2011.
- 345 19. ISO. 2017. ISO 21702: Measurement of antiviral activity on plastics and other non-
346 porous surfaces.
- 347 20. Nakano R, Hara M, Ishiguro H, Yao Y, Ochiai T, Nakata K, Murakami T, Kajioka J,
348 Sunada K, Hashimoto K, Fujishima A, Kubota Y. 2013. Broad Spectrum Microbicidal
349 Activity of Photocatalysis by TiO₂. *Catalysts* 3:310-323.
- 350 21. Warnes SL, Little ZR, Keevil CW. 2015. Human Coronavirus 229E Remains Infectious
351 on Common Touch Surface Materials. *mBio* 6:e01697-15.
- 352 22. Behzadinasab S, Chin A, Hosseini M, Poon LLM, Ducker WA. 2020. A Surface Coating
353 that Rapidly Inactivates SARS-CoV-2. *ACS Appl Mater Interfaces*
354 doi:10.1021/acsami.0c11425.
- 355 23. Sunada K, Minoshima M, Hashimoto K. 2012. Highly efficient antiviral and antibacterial
356 activities of solid-state cuprous compounds. *J Hazard Mater* 235-236:265-70.
- 357 24. Joonaki E, Hassanpouryouzband A, Heldt CL, Areo O. 2020. Surface Chemistry Can
358 Unlock Drivers of Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in a Variety of Environmental
359 Conditions. *Chem* 6:2135-2146.

- 360 25. Botequim D, Maia J, Lino MM, Lopes LM, Simões PN, Ilharco LM, Ferreira L. 2012.
361 Nanoparticles and surfaces presenting antifungal, antibacterial and antiviral properties.
362 *Langmuir* 28:7646-56.
- 363 26. Boyce JM, Havill NL, Guercia KA, Schweon SJ, Moore BA. 2014. Evaluation of two
364 organosilane products for sustained antimicrobial activity on high-touch surfaces in
365 patient rooms. *Am J Infect Control* 42:326-8.
- 366 27. Su, Wong, Shi, Liu, Lai, Zhou, Liu, Bi, Gao. 2016. Epidemiology, Genetic
367 Recombination, and Pathogenesis of Coronaviruses. *Trends in Microbiology* 24:490-502.
- 368 28. Bar-On YM, Flamholz A, Phillips R, Milo R. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) by the
369 numbers. *eLife* 9.
- 370 29. Shewale JG, Ratcliff JL. 2021. Overinterpretation of the antiviral results for human
371 coronavirus strain 229E (HCoV-229E) relative to severe acute respiratory syndrome
372 coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2). *Journal of Medical Virology* 93:1900-1902.
- 373 30. Gerba CP. 2015. Quaternary Ammonium Biocides: Efficacy in Application. *Applied and*
374 *environmental microbiology* 81:464-469.
- 375 31. Zhou, Zuber, Cantergiani, Butot, Li, Stroheker, Devlieghere, Lima, Piantini, Uyttendaele.
376 2017. Inactivation of viruses and bacteria on strawberries using a levulinic acid plus
377 sodium dodecyl sulfate based sanitizer, taking sensorial and chemical food safety aspects
378 into account. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 257:176-182.
- 379 32. ISO. 2017. ISO 15216-1:2017: Microbiology of the food chain — Horizontal method for
380 determination of hepatitis A virus and norovirus in food using real-time RT-PCR — Part
381 1: Method for quantification.

- 382 33. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, Niemeyer D,
383 Jones TC, Vollmar P, Rothe C, Hoelscher M, Bleicker T, Brünink S, Schneider J,
384 Ehmann R, Zwirgmaier K, Drosten C, Wendtner C. 2020. Virological assessment of
385 hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* 581:465-469.
- 386 34. Zhu J, Guo J, Xu Y, Chen X. 2020. Viral dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva from
387 infected patients. *Journal of Infection* 81:e48-e50.

388

389 **Figure 1.** Survival of HCoV-229E (blue) and SARS-CoV-2 (grey) on non-coated surfaces (solid
390 bars) and on coated surfaces (hatched bars) after 0, 30 or 120 minutes of contact times at room
391 temperature (A: ROS-based, B: copper compound-based, C: QAC-based). Time “0” corresponds
392 to 15 minutes drying after spiking of the virus on the surfaces. Bars with asterisks highlight the
393 \log_{10} values below the LOQ. The LOQ for both viruses was $1.05 \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/25 \text{ cm}^2$ for the
394 copper compound-based coating, whereas the QAC-based coating induced cytotoxicity on the
395 two cell lines increasing the LOQ for both viruses to $3.15 \log_{10} \text{TCID}_{50}/25 \text{ cm}^2$. Error bars
396 represent the standard deviation; n=3.

397 **Figure 2.** Survival of HCoV-229E (blue) and SARS-CoV-2 (grey) on non-coated surfaces (solid
398 bars) and on coated surfaces (hatched bars) after 1, 7, 30 or 90 rounds of cleaning with a water-
399 based detergent using a microfiber cloth (A: copper compound-based, B: QAC-based). Bars with
400 asterisks highlight the \log_{10} values below the LOQ. Error bars represent the standard deviation;
401 n=3.

402 **Figure 3.** Survival of SARS-CoV-2 (grey) on non-coated surfaces (solid bars) and on coated
403 surfaces (hatched bars) after 1, 7, 30 or 90 rounds of disinfection with 70% ethanol using a

404 microfiber cloth (A: copper compound-based, B: QAC-based). Bars with asterisks highlight the
405 \log_{10} values below the LOQ. Error bars represent the standard deviation; n=3.

406 **Figure 4.** Survival of HCoV-229E (blue) and SARS-CoV-2 (grey) on non-coated surfaces (solid
407 bars) and on copper compound-based coated surfaces (hatched bars) previously finger-touched 0,
408 10 or 50 times. Bars with asterisks highlight the \log_{10} values below the LOQ. Error bars
409 represent the standard deviation; n=3.







