


VOLUME 54 NUMBER 2 2004

ISSN 1590-4261

ANNALS OF MICROBIOLOGY

Formerly ANNALI DI MICROBIOLOGIA ED ENZIMOLOGIA



University of Milan
Department of Food Science and Microbiology
Via G. Celoria 2, 20133 Milano, Italy

www.annmicro.unimi.it

**ANNALS
OF
MICROBIOLOGY**

Formerly
ANNALI DI MICROBIOLOGIA ED ENZIMOLOGIA

ENVIRONMENTAL, FOOD, GENERAL, INDUSTRIAL,
MARINE AND SOIL MICROBIOLOGY
&
BIOTECHNOLOGY

<http://www.annmicro.unimi.it>

Aim and scope

The journal publishes original articles covering aspects of fundamental and applied microbiology including bacteria, fungi, algae, protozoa and viruses. The topics included are general, environmental, ecological, food and industrial microbiology, concerning taxonomy, physiology, biochemistry, biotechnology and molecular biology.

Types of contribution

1. Original research papers
2. Review articles
3. Short Communications
4. Book Reviews

Papers should be complete in themselves and supported by experimental details. The authors must guarantee that submitted manuscripts have not been published previously nor submitted for publication elsewhere.

Review articles should cover subjects falling within the scope of the journal, which are of active current interest.

A Short Communication is a concise report of important findings that merit rapid publication.

Book Reviews will be included in the journal on a range of relevant recent books.

Copyright

Once a paper has been published it becomes property of "Annals of Microbiology" and the authors must agree to automatic transfer of the copyright to the publisher.

Property of the University of Milan
Department of Food Science and Microbiology
Via G. Celoria 2, 20133 Milano, Italy
Printed in Italy

Submission procedure

Manuscripts should be submitted in two copies including figures, tables and original photographs to:

ANNALS of MICROBIOLOGY
Via Celoria 2, 20133 Milano, Italy
Fax: +39-0250316694
E-mail: annals.microbiology@unimi.it

For the initial submission of manuscripts and for the processing of accepted papers, an electronic version and the original photographs of the images are preferred. File format should be compatible with recent versions of Microsoft Word for text and TIFF, EPS, JPEG for the images.

Text and graphics generated on Macintosh platforms will also be acceptable.

Abstracted/indexed in:

Agricola, AATA Online-Art and Archaeology Technical Abstracts, Biological Abstracts, BIOSIS Prev., Biotechnology Citation Index, CAB Abstracts, Chemical Abstracts, Elsevier Bibliographic Databases, Food Science and Technology Abstracts, ISPI-International Society for Pest Information, Journal Citation Reports-Science Edition, Ulrich's Periodicals DirectoryTM, Vitis-Viticulture and Enology Abstracts.



Associate USPI
Unione Stampa
Periodica Italiana

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Annual subscription price (2004 - one volume of four issues), all prices include postage and packing:
Personal rate: EUR 80.00; Institutional rate: EUR 160.00; Supporting rate: EUR 517.00; Sponsors: EUR 775.00.

Subscription orders should be addressed to: ANNALS OF MICROBIOLOGY
Via Celoria 2, 20133 Milano, Italy
Phone: +39-0250316725/3 Fax: +39-0250316694
E-mail: annals.microbiology@unimi.it

**ANNALS
OF
MICROBIOLOGY**

Formerly
ANNALI DI MICROBIOLOGIA ED ENZIMOLOGIA

ENVIRONMENTAL, FOOD, GENERAL, INDUSTRIAL,
MARINE AND SOIL MICROBIOLOGY
&
BIOTECHNOLOGY

<http://www.annmicro.unimi.it>

Editor-in-Chief

Claudia SORLINI, University of Milan, Italy

Editorial Assistant

Annunciata ADAMI, University of Milan, Italy

Editorial Board

Marco BAZZICALUPO
University of Firenze, Italy

Bruno BIAVATI
University of Bologna, Italy

Vittorio BOTTAZZI
University of Piacenza, Italy

Enrico CERNIA
University "La Sapienza" of Roma, Italy

Francesca CLEMENTI
University of Ancona, Italy

Zvi COHEN
Ben Gurion University, Israel

Salvatore COPPOLA
University of Napoli, Italy

James G. FERRY
The Pennsylvania State University, USA

Tajalli KESHAVARZ
University of Westminster, UK

David LLOYD
Cardiff University, UK

Pier Luigi MANACHINI
University of Milan, Italy

Riccardo MATERASSI
University of Firenze, Italy

Roberto MATTINA
University of Milan, Italy

Ralph MITCHELL
Harvard University, USA

Philippe NORMAND
Université Claude Bernard-Lyon 1, France

Giorgio OTTOGALLI
University of Milan, Italy

Mario POLSINELLI
University of Firenze, Italy

I. Sakkie PRETORIUS
The Australian Wine Research Institute,
Australia

Patrizia ROMANO
University of Potenza, Italy

Cesareo SAIZ-JIMENEZ
University of Sevilla, Spain

Siegfried SCHERER
Technical University of Munich, Germany

Pascal SIMONET
Université Claude Bernard-Lyon 1, France

Lucas J. STAL
Netherlands Institute of Ecology, NL

Stefania STEFANI
University of Catania, Italy

Valter TANDOI
The National Research Council, Italy

Timothy WHITMORE
WRc-NSF Ltd, UK

Carlo ZAMBONELLI
University of Bologna, Italy

GUIDE TO AUTHORS

- 1. Manuscript.** Papers should be written in English, typewritten, double-spaced, on one side only of white paper with wide margins on all four sides and should have line numbers. Please indicate in the left margin where figures, tables and photographs are to be inserted.
- 2. First page.** The first page of the manuscript should comprise the title, the authors' names, the authors' affiliations, the abstract, key words, and any necessary footnotes referring to the corresponding author. Footnotes should be indicated by asterisks numbered consecutively:
* ** ***
, , , .
- 3. Abstract.** The abstract should give the most important results and should not exceed 200 words (100 words for a Short Communication). Authors should provide three to five key words placed directly below the abstract.
- 4. Text.** Beginning with a new page, the paper should be divided into: Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion. References should be cited in the text by the author and year arranged chronologically. If a publication has been written by more than two authors the name of the first author should be used followed by "et al.". Citations regarding "unpublished results" or papers "in preparation" should be included in the text but not in the reference list.
- 5. References.** The reference list at the end of the paper should include only works cited in the text and should be arranged alphabetically by the name of the first author, and chronologically per author. References should be cited as follows:
Journal papers: Lowry O.H., Resebrough N.J., Farr A.L. (1951). Protein measurement with the Folin-phenol reagent. *J. Biol. Chem.*, 193: 265-275.
Books: Kurtzman C.P., Fell J.W., Eds (1998). *The Yeasts, A Taxonomic Study*, 4th edn., Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam.
Ehrlich H.L. (1990). *Geomicrobiology*, 2nd edn., Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York.
Articles cited from a book or edited symposium: Burton J.C. (1979). *Rhizobium* species. In: Peppler H.J., Perlman D., Eds, *Microbial Technology*. Vol. 1, Academic Press, New York, pp. 29-31.
- 6. Illustrations.** Clear and legible graphs, diagrams, charts, other line drawings and photographs should be submitted with legends double-spaced on separate sheets. The figures must be numbered consecutively in Arabic numerals.
Tables. Tables are to be typed double-spaced including headings and footnotes. Each table should be typed on a separate page, numbered consecutively and without vertical lines.
Line drawings. Please submit high-quality line diagrams in black ink on a white background. Inserted numerals, symbols and essential lettering should be no smaller than 2 mm after photographic reduction. Computer generated graphics may be laser printed.
Photographs. Black and white photographs should be well-contrasted glossy prints. Colour photographs are accepted and converted in black and white. Electron micrographs or photomicrographs should include a scale bar directly on the print. Colour print of photographs will be charged.
- 7. Abbreviations and units.** The international system of units (SI) should be used. Use the term % in its correct sense otherwise the term v/v or w/v must be used. If a non-standard abbreviation is to be used, it should be defined in full in the text.
- 8. Nomenclature.** Latin names must be written in italics. Microorganisms, including the indication of their collection number, should be designated according to the Approved Lists of Bacterial Names (American Society for Microbiology, 1989) and the validation lists and articles published in the *International Journal of Systematic Bacteriology* since 1989. The approved terminology for yeast may be found in: *The Yeasts, A Taxonomic Study* (Kurtzman C.P. and Fell J.W., Eds, Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1998). The first time that the microorganism's name is used in the text the genus and the species should be written in full; subsequently, the genus may be abbreviated to its capitalized initial letter if the context makes the meaning clear. If there are several generic names in the text with the same initial letter, the names should be written in full at each occurrence. For enzymes, use the name assigned by IUB Nomenclature Committee as described in *Enzyme Nomenclature* (Academic Press, Inc., New York, N.Y., 1992).
- 9. Acknowledgements.** Acknowledgements should be as brief as possible and should follow the text and precede the references.
- 10. Proofs.** Proofs will be sent to the corresponding author to be checked for type setting accuracy and should be returned to the direction of the journal within 2 days of receipt. No changes to the original manuscript will be allowed at this stage. Correction to the proofs must be restricted to the printer's errors only. Any other alterations will be charged to the author/s.
- 11. Reprints.** Reprints may be ordered on the order form accompanying the proofs. If the reprints are not ordered, publishing the article will be charged of EUR 75.00.

Sponsors

KRAFT FOODS ITALIA S.p.A., Milano

Supporting Subscribers

Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Agro-Alimentari, Ambientali e Microbiologiche,
Università del Molise, Campobasso

Istituto di Microbiologia, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Piacenza

Front cover: Mixed culture with roundish cells of *Chlorella* (450x). C. Sorlini, E. Cesarotti, F. Cariati, M. Cotali, C. Bianchi, G. Ranalli in *Ann. Microbiol.*, 41, 1991, p. 270.

Property: University of Milan - Department of Food Science and Microbiology

Editorial and Administrative Office: Via G. Celoria 2, 20133 Milano, Italy

Editor-in-Chief: Prof. C. SORLINI - Dec. Trib. of Milan 15-1-1971, N. 14

Typesetter: Nuova Videostena - Via F. Brioschi 22, Milano

Printer: Arti Grafiche Decembrio s.r.l. - Via Decembrio 23, Milano

Printed in Italy

A new methodology for decontamination of dental instruments by an ultrasonic cleaner based on Sweep System Technology

P. DI GENNARO¹, G. BESTETTI^{1*}, A. RADAELLI², M. PAGANINI³,
C. DE GIULI MORGHEN³, M. NERI³

¹Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Milano-Bicocca, 20126 Milano;

²Department of Pharmacological Sciences, ³Department of Medical Pharmacology, University of Milan, 20129 Milano, Italy

Received 20 January 2004 / Accepted 25 February 2004

Abstract - The efficiency of a decontamination procedure by sonication for different dental instruments after experimental microbial and viral contamination was tested. Both germicidal and virucidal activity of sonication in the presence or absence of a cationic biguanid disinfectant was assessed following three different disinfection/sterilisation protocols. Dental instruments were contaminated with a mixed culture of *Enterococcus faecium*, *Staphylococcus* sp., *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Mycobacterium* sp., *Escherichia coli* and *Bacillus subtilis*, or with Poliovirus type 1 and Herpesvirus simplex type 1 (HHV-1), exposed to ultrasonic treatment in an ultrasonic bath and the surviving microorganisms titered. The results showed that an effective disinfection of dental instruments, expressed by an equal or higher than 4 logs microbial and viral reduction, can be obtained after 15 min or 10 min sonication in an ultrasonic cleaner equipped with a Sweep System Technology. Conversely, by the combined action of chemical disinfection and ultrasonic treatment in the same device, a sterilising effect was obtained after only 5 min for microbial and 10-15 min for virally contaminated instruments. The synergistic effect of chemical and physical means, as already accepted as an effective cleaning procedure of medical instruments, can therefore be applied to obtain a safe and effective sterilisation of dental instruments potentially contaminated by organic fluids and dental material harbouring pathogenic microbes and viruses.

Key words: disinfection, sterilisation, ultrasounds, dental instruments, ultrasonic cleaner.

INTRODUCTION

The control of the transmission of infectious agents in practical medicine as well as in the practice of dentistry has become a very critical issue since the early 1980s, when Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease-variant (vCJD) and Human Hepatitis C Virus (HCV) were found to be

* Corresponding Author. Phone: +39 0264482925; Fax: +39 0264482996; E-mail: Giuseppe.Bestetti@unimib.it

transmitted by medical devices contaminated with human material (Will and Matthews, 1982; Smith *et al.*, 2002). Since all patients can represent a potential source of infection (Ingrosso *et al.*, 1999), it is necessary to adopt an appropriate protocol for the decontamination, cleaning and sterilisation of instruments used for each patient (Burkhart and Crawford, 1997). In particular, the treatment of dental instruments to be reused must follow a standardised protocol that provides subsequent steps of decontamination, cleaning and sterilisation. The decontamination procedure is mandatory when instruments are used in patients who have a case history of serious infectious diseases such as viral hepatitis, AIDS (Lewis and Arens, 1995) and tuberculosis. After decontamination, the cleaning of the instruments is also an obligatory step, because, if not performed correctly, it may compromise the final process of sterilisation (Stach *et al.*, 1995). Indeed, the removal of organic material before sterilisation is essential (Burkhart and Crawford, 1997), since the presence of organic debris can protect the microorganisms from inactivation. The last step is the sterilisation or disinfection that depends on the nature and utilisation of the instruments. It is therefore important to consider that the incorrect execution of even a single phase of the process can influence the final result (Sanchez and MacDonald, 1995).

Depending on their utilisation, it is important to evaluate the risk of transmission of infectious material by non-disposable recycled dental devices that have been used on patients and managed by auxiliary personnel but not adequately pre-decontaminated, disinfected or sterilised.

The cleaning of instruments is therefore essential to make disinfection and sterilisation procedures effective, and to protect auxiliary personnel from potential cross-infections. A wide variety of chemicals were used, alone or in combination (Angelillo *et al.*, 1998; Jatzwauk *et al.*, 2001) with other physical methods like ultrasounds (Weller *et al.*, 1980; Watmough, 1994; Cafruny *et al.*, 1995; Bettner *et al.*, 1998; Walmsley, 1998; Filho *et al.*, 2001) to clean instruments and equipment, but their appropriate use was never defined (Miller *et al.*, 1993, 2000). Recently, a new ultrasonic apparatus (SONICA® ultrasonic cleaner), equipped with a system of modulation frequency ranging between 43 and 45 kHz delivered by two separate transducers, was developed and commercialised by Soltec®, with the aim to improve the process of decontamination/sterilisation of medical and dental devices.

The aim of this study was to evaluate the efficacy of a new method based on the combined effect of chemical and ultrasound treatment for disinfection of dental instruments experimentally contaminated by human pathogenic bacteria and viruses.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The ultrasonic apparatus. The ultrasonic bath cleaner was the SONICA 2200EP Sweep System, an ultrasonic device developed and commercialised by Soltec® company (Milano, Italy) to clean and disinfect/sterilise medical and dental instruments by the combined use of a chemical disinfectant and ultrasounds. The ultrasonic waves are delivered from the bottom of the unit with a frequency of 43-45 kHz by two separate transducers delivering a total of 130

Watts. To improve the disinfection's procedure the apparatus can also warm up the cleaning solution by a resistance of 305 Watts fitted under the bottom panel.

The SONICA® CL 4% is a cleaning/disinfectant solution with a pH of 6.5-7.5 composed of 15% cetrimide, 1.5% chlorexidine gluconate, 6% isopropyl alcohol, and 0.1% E110 in water. As specified by the manufacturer, the solution was utilised at 2% in sterile distilled water warmed up to 40 °C in the SONICA 2200EP Sweep System ultrasonic device.

Bacterial strains and growth conditions. *Enterococcus faecium*, *Staphylococcus* sp., *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Mycobacterium* sp., *Escherichia coli* and *Bacillus subtilis* strains were utilised to perform the bacterial contamination of the instruments. These strains were grown overnight at 30 °C in Luria-Bertani (LB) medium. As *Mycobacterium* sp. growth was slow, this strain was grown in LB medium added with glucose 0.2% and incubated until the cultural optical density reached the same value as the cultures of other bacteria. *Bacillus subtilis* was used to provide cultures with a high percentage of spores.

Viral strains and cell cultures. The attenuated Poliovirus type 1 (Sabin vaccine strain) and the clinical isolate of Human Herpes simplex virus type 1 (HHV-1) we used are a RNA non-enveloped and a DNA-enveloped human viruses respectively. They are characterised by a high replicative activity in a broad range of human and animal cells. These viruses are the prototype viruses generally used in antiviral tests for their relative resistance to common disinfectants. Both viruses were grown on confluent mycoplasma-free green monkey kidney cells (VERO), plaque purified and titred on the same cells.

Dental instruments contamination. Sets of dental instruments (dental pincers and tongs) were contaminated with: 1) a mixed bacterial culture containing at the same ratio *Enterococcus faecium*, *Staphylococcus* sp., *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Mycobacterium* sp., and *Escherichia coli*; 2) the endospore-forming *Bacillus subtilis*; 3) the RNA-virus Polio1; 4) the DNA-virus HHV-1.

The dental instruments were immersed at room temperature in the bacterial suspensions, 10⁹ Colony Forming Units (CFU)/ml in LB medium, for 1 h or in the viral suspensions only for 5 min to minimise the spontaneous viral inactivation.

For viral contamination, 10 ml of Dulbecco Modified Essential Medium (DMEM), supplemented with 10% newborn calf serum (CS) to mimic the protein content of biological material, was inoculated with 10⁹ Plaque Forming Units (10⁸ PFU/ml) of Poliovirus1 or 10¹⁰ PFU (10⁹ PFU/ml) of HHV-1.

The dental instruments were then drained away for 15 s and then utilised for three different cleaning/disinfection procedures called Protocol A, B, and C.

Protocol A - Chemical decontamination without ultrasonic treatment. The contaminated instruments were placed into the decontamination tank containing 1000 ml of 2%-diluted SONICA® CL 4% disinfectant, with an initial number of 10⁶ CFU/ml mixed bacterial cells or *Bacillus subtilis*, or 4.25 x 10⁵ PFU/ml Poliovirus1, or 2.2 x 10⁶ PFU/ml HHV-1. The treatment was maintained for 30 min at 40 °C without sonication. Samples were collected at 0, 5, 15, 30 min and their residual bacterial or viral population determined.

Protocol B - Ultrasonic treatment. In order to evaluate the effect of sonication on the bacterial and viral population in the absence of a preliminary disinfection procedure, the contaminated instruments were placed into 1000 ml of 10 mM Phosphate Buffered Saline (PBS) in the ultrasonic bath set at 40 °C. The treatment was maintained for 30 min. Samples were collected and analysed at 0, 5, 15, 30 min.

Protocol C - Chemical decontamination combined with ultrasonic treatment. The contaminated instruments treated by chemical decontamination for 5 min in the decontamination tank (Protocol A) were therefore immersed in the ultrasonic bath containing the same disinfection solution at 40 °C. The treatment was maintained for 30 min. Samples were collected and analysed at 0, 5, 15, 30 min.

Bactericidal activity test. The number of living and dead bacteria, before and after the three treatments indicated in the A, B, C protocols, was determined either by plate counting or by fluorescence microscopy.

Plate counts. Aliquots (1 ml) of samples were diluted in M9 Mineral Medium and appropriate dilutions were placed on plate agar containing LB medium. The samples were incubated at 30 °C for 24 h. The number of viable bacteria (CFU/ml) were determined at the different times of treatment.

Fluorescence microscopy. The counts of total bacteria were performed in the presence of the fluorochromes SYBR Green I and propidium iodide, emitting light after excitation in the green and red fluorescence, respectively. SYBR Green is a molecule, which stains all the cells, either dead or alive. Conversely, propidium iodide can penetrate only cells with a damaged membrane. It is therefore possible to distinguish the living (green) cells from the dead (red) ones. For cell staining, 10 µl of each fluorochrome in 1 ml of culture sample were utilised. For each treatment, several samples were analysed by an epifluorescent microscope to identify and count the differently stained bacteria. The observation of the samples was performed with an Axiolab HB050 Zeiss, equipped with a high-pressure mercury bulb and a filter set type UV-2A EX 330-380 and G2AEX510-560.

Virucidal activity test. Virucidal activity was evaluated by the reduction of at least 99.99% infectivity (4 logs) of test viruses after treatments as in A, B, and C protocols.

At the end of each protocol the instruments were “washed” in 10 ml of DMEM 10% CS for 5 min and the residual virus in the medium titred on confluent VERO cells. As a control, the virus present on the instruments immediately after contamination was also titred.

RESULTS

Sets of dental instruments were contaminated with a mixed bacterial culture containing *Enterococcus faecium*, *Staphylococcus* sp., *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Mycobacterium* sp., and *Escherichia coli*, or the endospore-forming *Bacillus subtilis*. Similarly, identical sets of dental devices were contaminated with

the RNA-virus Polio1 or the DNA-virus HHV-1. The dental instruments were then immersed in the bacterial suspension for 1 h or in the viral suspension for only 5 min to minimise the spontaneous viral inactivation. The contaminated instruments were then submitted to three different cleaning/disinfection procedures called Protocol A, B, and C as described in Methods.

Chemical decontamination without ultrasonic treatment (Protocol A)

Results of bacterial number after decontamination are reported in Table 1. Data show that the total bacterial number decreased of about 3 logs after 5 min of treatment and, after 15 min, the complete absence of living cells was observed.

The titration of Poliovirus1 and HHV-1 before and after treatment was done in triplicate on confluent VERO cells. The effect of chemical disinfection on the viruses present on contaminated instruments parallels the results obtained with bacteria. In particular, a uniform 3-logs decrease was observed after 5 min treatment and a complete virus inactivation after 15 min.

Ultrasonic treatment (Protocol B)

The results of the effect of sonication on the bacterial and viral population in the absence of a preliminary disinfection procedure are reported in Table 2. Sonication alone can only partially reduce the microbial population from 10^6 to 10^2 CFU/ml, thus suggesting the need of a chemical disinfectant to support and complement the physical action of sonication in killing of resistant microorganisms.

The ultrasound treatment alone resulted however very effective to inactivate both RNA (Polio 1) and DNA (HHV-1) containing viruses. In fact, the virus titer dropped by 3-logs after 5 min, and was reduced to zero after 15 min of sonication.

Chemical decontamination combined with ultrasonic treatment (Protocol C)

The results obtained by protocols A and B suggested a subsequent evaluation of the combined effect of chemical and ultrasound treatments. The result of the combined chemical/physical treatment on bacteria and viruses survival is reported in Table 3.

The enumeration of living microorganisms, after 5 min sonication of the contaminated instruments, revealed the complete inactivation of the bacterial mixture and *Bacillus subtilis*.

Moreover we could observe that when the experiments were performed with cultures of *Bacillus subtilis* in which most cells were spores, the contribution of ultrasound treatment to their inactivation was important. In this case, as shown in Table 2, a relevant part (8×10^3 CFU/ml) of bacteria remained viable in the solution still after 15 min, and only the effect of the ultrasonic bath determined their complete inactivation (Table 3, Fig. 1). A control experiment with cells incubated after this treatment was also performed to exclude that spores could become vegetative forms (data not shown).

The procedure outlined in Protocol C showed high efficacy on instruments contaminated by viruses. A 1-log reduction after 5 min and a complete sterilisation after 15 min were observed with dental instruments carrying the low but significant amount of virus left from the disinfection procedure.

TABLE 1 – Efficacy of chemical disinfection on bacterial and viral population (Protocol A)

Treatment time (min)	Bacterial number (CFU/ml)											
	0			5			15			30		
	P. C.*	F. M.§		P. C.*	F. M.§		P. C.*	F. M.§		P. C.*	F. M.§	
	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Red
Bacterial mixture	1 x 10 ⁶	1 x 10 ⁶	0	2 x 10 ³	1 x 10 ³	9 x 10 ⁵	0	0	1 x 10 ⁶	0	0	1 x 10 ⁶
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	1 x 10 ⁶	1 x 10 ⁶	0	1 x 10 ⁶	1 x 10 ⁶	0	0	0	1 x 10 ⁶	0	0	1 x 10 ⁶
	Virus titer (PFU/ml)											
Treatment time (min)	0			5			15			30		
Poliovirus 1	4.25 x 10 ⁵			1 x 10 ²			0		0		0	
HHV-1	2.2 x 10 ⁶			1 x 10 ³			0		0		0	

*P.C. = Plate Counting; §F.M. = Fluorescence Microscopy.

TABLE 2 – Efficacy of ultrasound treatment on bacterial and viral population (Protocol B)

Treatment time (min)	Bacterial number (CFU/ml)															
	0				5				15				30			
	P. C.*	F. M.§		P. C.*	F. M.§		P. C.*	F. M.§		P. C.*	F. M.§		P. C.*	F. M.§		
	Green	Red		Green	Red		Green	Red		Green	Red		Green	Red		
Microbial mixture	9×10^6	9×10^6	0	9×10^3	8×10^3	8×10^6	8×10^2	8×10^6	9×10^2	8×10^2	9×10^6	8×10^2	8×10^2	7×10^2	9×10^6	
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	1×10^6	1×10^6	0	1×10^3	1×10^3	9×10^5	1×10^2	9×10^5	8×10^3	1×10^2	9×10^5	1×10^2	1×10^2	1×10^5		
	Virus titer (PFU/ml)															
Treatment time (min)	0				5				15				30			
Poliovirus 1	4.25×10^5			2×10^2			0			0			0			
HHV-1	2.2×10^6			2.5×10^3			0			0			0			

*P.C. = Plate Counting; §F.M. = Fluorescence Microscopy.

TABLE 3 – Efficacy of combined chemical and ultrasound treatment on bacterial and viral population (Protocol C)

Treatment time (min)	Bacterial number (CFU/ml)															
	Initial bacterial number			0 [#]			5 [#]			15 [#]			30 [#]			
	P. C.*	F. M.§	Green	P. C.*	F. M.§	Green	P. C.*	F. M.§	Green	P. C.*	F. M.§	Green	P. C.*	F. M.§	Green	
Microbial mixture	1 x 10 ⁶	1 x 10 ⁶	0	2 x 10 ³	1 x 10 ³	9 x 10 ⁵	0	0	1 x 10 ⁶	0	0	1 x 10 ⁶	0	0	1 x 10 ⁶	
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	1 x 10 ⁶	1 x 10 ⁶	0	1 x 10 ⁶	1 x 10 ⁶	0	0	0	8 x 10 ⁵	0	0	7 x 10 ⁵	0	0	7 x 10 ⁵	
Virus titer (PFU/ml)																
Treatment time (min)	Initial virus number			0			5			15			30			
Poliovirus 1	4.25 x 10 ⁵			1 x 10 ²			1.7 x 10 ¹			0			0			
HHV-1	2.2 x 10 ⁶			1 x 10 ³			1.1 x 10 ¹			0			0			

*P.C. = Plate Counting; §F.M. = Fluorescence Microscopy; #Time (min) after 5 min chemical disinfection.




FIG. 1 – Fluorescence microscopy showing living (green) and dead (red) bacteria present in the solution of contaminated instruments before (A) and after (B) 15 min of treatment with Protocol C.

DISCUSSION

Ultrasounds have been utilised for long time as an effective means to clean surgical instruments (Weller *et al.*, 1980) and, in particular, dental devices (Walmsley, 1998) before sterilisation. Although the virucidal effect of high frequency sound waves on tobacco mosaic virus was previously shown (Oster *et al.*, 1947), our results demonstrated that the disinfectant solution we tested is able to inactivate different bacteria as well as non-enveloped RNA and enveloped DNA viruses after 15 min. Particularly resistant bacteria as *B. subtilis* need more time or a different treatment because Protocol A is unable to kill viruses or microbial cells in less than 15 min. Treatment with ultrasounds with or without the chemical disinfectant SONICA® CL 4% in the cleaning solution (Protocol B) was equally efficient with viruses although requesting more time (over 30 min) to completely inactivate bacteria. Conversely, the combined procedure (Protocol C) of a disinfectant and ultrasounds completely inactivates viruses and bacteria after 15 min of treatment.

On the basis of these results, we demonstrated that this methodology, based on the innovative Sweep System Technology delivering a homogeneous frequency of 43-45 kHz by two separate transducers, coupled to the use of a mild chemical disinfectant at 40 °C, was able to inactivate bacteria and viruses from experimentally contaminated instruments and confirm the general effectiveness of ultrasounds in cleaning dental instruments (Cafruny *et al.*, 1995; Bettner *et al.*, 1998).

Protocol C, which we found to be the only one able to sterilise in less than 15 min the contaminated dental devices, should therefore be utilised by all dental practitioners during their clinical interventions on patients of unknown case history.

Acknowledgments

We thank Soltec® Company (Milano, Italy) for providing the SONICA 2200EP ultrasonic cleaner and SONICA® CL 4% disinfectant.

REFERENCES

- Angelillo I.F., Bianco A., Nobile C.G., Pavia M. (1998). Evaluation of the efficacy of glutaraldehyde and peroxygen for disinfection of dental instruments. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.*, 27(5): 292-296.
- Bettner M.D., Beiswanger M.A., Miller C.H., Palenik C.J. (1998). Effect of ultrasonic cleaning on microorganisms. *Am. J. Dent.*, 11(4): 185-188.
- Burkhart N.W., Crawford J. (1997). Critical steps in instrument cleaning: removing debris after sonication. *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.*, 128(4): 456-463.
- Cafruny W.A., Brunick A., Nelson D.M., Nelson R.F. (1995). Effectiveness of ultrasonic cleaning of dental instruments. *Am. J. Dent.*, 8(3): 152-156.
- Filho M.T., Leonardo M.R., Bonifacio K.C., Dametto F.R., Silva I.A. (2001). The use of ultrasound for cleaning the surface of stainless steel and nickel-titanium endodontic instruments. *Int. Endod. J.*, 34(8): 581-585.
- Ingrosso L., Pisani F., Pocchiari M. (1999). Transmission of the 236K scrapie strain by the dental route. *J. Gen. Virol.*, 80: 3043-3047.
- Jatzwauk L., Schöne H., Pietsch H. (2001). How to improve instrument disinfection by ultrasound. *J. Hosp. Infect.*, 48 (Supp. A): S80-S83.
- Lewis D.L., Arens M. (1995). Resistance of microorganisms to disinfection in dental and medical devices. *Nat. Med.*, 1(9): 956-958.
- Miller C.H., Rigger S.D., Sheldrake M.A., Neeb J.M. (1993). Presence of microorganisms in used ultrasonic cleaning solutions. *Am. J. Dent.*, 6(1): 27-31.
- Miller C.H., Tan C.M., Beiswanger M.A., Gaines D.J., Setcos J.C., Palenik C.J. (2000). Cleaning dental instruments: measuring the effectiveness of an instrument washer/disinfector. *Am. J. Dent.*, 13(1): 39-43.
- Oster G. (1947). Studies on the sonic treatment of tobacco mosaic virus. *J. Gen. Physiol.*, 31: 89-92.
- Sanchez E., MacDonald G. (1995). Decontaminating dental instruments: testing the effectiveness of selected methods. *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.*, 126(3): 359-362.
- Smith A., Dickson M., Aitken J., Bagg J. (2002). Contaminated dental instruments. *J. Hosp. Infect.*, 51(3): 233-235.
- Stach D.J., Cross-Poline G.N., Newman S.M., Tillis T.S. (1995). Effect of repeated sterilization and ultrasonic cleaning on curet blades. *J. Dent. Hyg.*, 69(1): 31-39.
- Walmsley A.D. (1998). Applications of ultrasound in dentistry. *Ultrasound Med. Biol.*, 14(1): 7-14.

- Watmough D.J. (1994). Role of ultrasonic cleaning in control of cross-infection in dentistry. *Ultrasonics*, 32(4): 315-317.
- Weller R.N., Brady J.M., Bernier W.E. (1980). Efficacy of ultrasonic cleaning. *J. Endod.*, 6(9): 740-743.
- Will R.G., Matthews W.B. (1982). Evidence for case-to-case transmission of Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease. *J. Neurosurg. Psych.*, 45: 235-238.