

1 **Indoor Exposure to Commonly Used Disinfectants during the COVID-19 Pandemic**

2 Guomao Zheng,¹ Gabriel Filippelli^{2,3}, Amina Salamova^{1*}

3 ¹ Paul H. O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University,
4 Bloomington, Indiana 47405

5 ² Center for Urban Health, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI),
6 Indianapolis, Indiana 46202


7 ³ Environmental Resilience Institute, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405

8
9 **Abstract**

10 Staying safe during the COVID-19 pandemic requires frequent disinfecting of the indoor
11 environment. Quaternary ammonium compounds (QACs or “quats”) are the major class of
12 chemicals widely used as disinfectants in consumer products. While disinfection is necessary for
13 a safe environment during the pandemic, the increased use of QACs is concerning as exposure to
14 these compounds has been associated with adverse effects on reproductive and respiratory systems.
15 We have determined the occurrence and distribution of 19 QACs in 46 residential dust collected
16 before and during the outbreak of COVID-19. All QACs were detected in more than 90% of the
17 samples at concentrations ranging from 1.95 to 531 µg/g (median 58.9 µg/g). Higher QAC
18 concentrations were found in dust collected before the COVID-19 pandemic and in homes with
19 higher disinfecting frequencies ($p < 0.05$). In addition, 7 products most frequently used in these
20 homes were analyzed, and QACs were detected at concentrations reaching up to 16,600 mg/L. The
21 QAC profiles in dust and in products were similar, suggesting that these products can be a
22 significant source of QACs. Our findings indicate that the indoor exposure to QACs is widespread,
23 raising concerns about increased exposure to these chemicals during the ongoing pandemic.

27 TOC art

28



29

30

31 INTRODUCTION

32 The spread of the SARS coronavirus 2, which causes the disease COVID-19, has spurred
33 a surge in the use of disinfectants to keep household environment safe.¹ Intensified cleaning
34 protocols during the COVID-19 pandemic specifically call for the increased use of disinfectants
35 in homes and high-risk public spaces, such as schools, health and other care facilities, food service
36 and work spaces.

37 Disinfecting products containing quaternary ammonium compounds (QACs), also referred
38 to as “quats”, are recommended by the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
39 (CDC) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for disinfecting procedures specifically
40 targeting the SARS coronavirus 2.² QACs are the major class of disinfectants and antimicrobials
41 used in cleaning products, biocides, personal care products, and biomedical materials.^{3,4} QACs are
42 salts of quaternary ammonium cations with at least one long hydrophobic chlorinated or

43 brominated hydrocarbon chain substituent and other short-chain substituents, such as methyl or
44 benzyl groups. These compounds are able to enrich the adipose cell membranes of living
45 organisms and thus disrupt the viral envelope and cell membrane and remove organic material. It
46 is this property in particular that enables QACs to act as disinfectants and antimicrobials.⁵ The
47 three most widely used QACs include benzylalkyldimethyl ammonium compounds (BACs, with
48 C6-C18 alkylated chains), dialkyldimethyl ammonium compounds (DDACs, with C8-C18
49 alkylated chains), and alkyltrimethyl ammonium compounds (ATMACs, with C8-C18 alkylated
50 chains) (Figure 1). The C12-, C14-, and C16-BACs, and C10- and C18-DDACs are high
51 production volume chemicals in the United States.⁶

52 Animal and human studies show that exposure to QACs is linked with reproductive and
53 neurodevelopmental toxicity,^{6,7} as well as with a significant increase in asthma triggers and other
54 breathing problems.^{7,8} In addition, QACs increase the permeability of outer membranes of living
55 organisms and their long-term use may disrupt the protective lipid membranes of the skin and
56 potentially increase the absorption of toxic substances. Hence, the increased use of household
57 disinfectants and other cleaning agents containing QACs during the COVID-19 pandemic is of
58 significant concern.

59 QACs have been detected in wastewater sludge, surface waters, and soil.^{4,6,9,10} A few
60 studies have reported high levels of QACs in fruits, food additives, milk, and other dairy
61 products.^{11-13,14,15} However, their occurrence in the indoor environment has not been investigated.
62 Household dust has long been recognized as a reservoir and a major human exposure pathway for
63 many environmental contaminants, especially for children.^{16,17} Due to their low volatility, QACs
64 are easily attached to solid airborne particles and absorbed to dust, where they are unlikely to
65 degrade. This leads to long-term contamination of the indoor environment, which is likely to last

66 long after the pandemic.¹⁸ Therefore, a better understanding of the increased exposure to QACs
67 during and after the COVID-19 pandemic is essential in order to assess its potential effects on
68 human health.

69 This is the first study to investigate the occurrence and distribution of 19 QACs in
70 residential dust collected before and during the outbreak of COVID-19 in the United States; to
71 evaluate the effect of disinfecting procedures on QAC levels in dust; and to assess daily intakes of
72 QACs in the indoor environment.

73

74 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

75 *Sample collection and analysis.* Forty-six house dust samples were collected from homes
76 in Indiana, United States. Six of them were obtained during 2018-2019 (before the outbreak of the
77 COVID-19 pandemic) as part of a citizen-science program (MapMyEnvironment.com). The rest
78 of the samples were collected during June 2020 (during the COVID-19 crisis in the United States).
79 Dust from vacuum containers and bags was transferred by the homeowner to resealable bags,
80 delivered or shipped to the laboratory, and stored at room temperature until analysis. In addition,
81 information on the frequency of cleaning or disinfecting and commonly used products in sampled
82 homes was collected. Cleaning products (sprays and wipes) listed by participants were purchased
83 from local markets for analysis.

84 All dust samples were sieved, and approximately 100 mg of dust was transferred to a glass
85 tube, spiked with a surrogate standard (d₇-C₁₂-BAC), sonicated in 4 mL of acetonitrile for 1 hour,
86 and centrifuged at 3000 rpm for 5 min. The supernatant was transferred into a clean tube and the
87 residues were re-extracted with 4 mL of acetonitrile twice. The combined extracts were
88 concentrated to 1 mL using nitrogen gas and spiked with an internal standard (d₇-C₁₄-BAC) used

89 for quantification of the target analytes. Ten μL of a cleaning product was diluted with 9.99 mL
90 acetonitrile, and then 1 mL of the diluted solution was spiked with an internal standard (d_7 -C14-
91 BAC). An ultra-performance liquid chromatograph coupled to a triple-quadrupole mass
92 spectrometer (Agilent 1290 Infinity II UPLC – 6470 QQQ-MS) in the positive electrospray
93 ionization (ESI+) mode was used for the analysis of 19 QACs. The complete analyte list and details
94 of the instrumental analysis and quality control and assurance measures are provided in the
95 Supporting Information.

96 *Data analysis.* Detailed information on estimated daily intake (EDI) calculations is
97 provided in the Supporting Information. Pearson coefficients were used to examine the correlations
98 of logarithmically transformed QAC concentrations in dust, and analyses of variance (ANOVA)
99 were used for comparative statistics. The significance level was set at $p < 0.05$.

100

101 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

102 *Concentrations in dust.* Each of the 19 QACs analyzed in these samples was detected in $> 90 \%$
103 of the samples at $\mu\text{g/g}$ concentration levels (Table 1). The total QAC concentration ($\sum\text{QAC}$, the
104 sum of 19 QACs) ranged from 1.95 to 531 $\mu\text{g/g}$ (median 58.9 $\mu\text{g/g}$). BACs were the major group
105 of QACs found in dust at a median $\sum\text{BAC}$ concentration (the sum of 7 BACs) of 27.1 $\mu\text{g/g}$,
106 followed by $\sum\text{DDAC}$ (median 12.3 $\mu\text{g/g}$; the sum of 6 DDACs), and $\sum\text{ATMAC}$ (median 8.78 $\mu\text{g/g}$;
107 the sum of 6 ATMACs), accounting for 56, 26, and 18% of the $\sum\text{QAC}$ concentrations, respectively.
108 C12- and C14-BACs were the most abundant QACs, and contributed 29% and 22% to the $\sum\text{QAC}$
109 concentrations, respectively. Among the DDACs and the ATMACs, C10- and C18-DDACs and
110 C16-ATMAC were the most abundant, respectively, and contributed 7.9-11% to the $\sum\text{QAC}$
111 concentrations. Overall, these 5 compounds comprised about 80 % of the $\sum\text{QAC}$ concentrations.

112 This high proportion is likely related to high production volumes and to the wide application of
113 these individual QACs.⁶ Moreover, these concentrations were significantly higher than those in
114 dust collected from Indiana homes before the COVID-19 crisis (median 35.9 ng/g, $p < 0.05$; Figure
115 2A and Table S5). Significant correlations were found among QAC concentrations (Table S3),
116 suggesting common sources for these compounds.

117 These results indicate humans can be exposed to high concentrations of QACs in the indoor
118 environment. When compared with the levels of other environmental contaminants reported in
119 dust from the United States, the median QAC concentration in this study was about 3 times higher
120 than that for organophosphate esters (16.8 $\mu\text{g/g}$)¹⁶ and about 1,000 times higher than that for per-
121 and polyfluoroalkyl substances (84.5 ng/g).¹⁷ On the other hand, these QAC levels were about 6
122 times lower than that for phthalates (median 396 $\mu\text{g/g}$).¹⁹ Incidentally, QACs have been detected
123 in the ambient environment, although at lower levels; for example, they are present in urban
124 estuarine sediment from New York, United States (median 29 $\mu\text{g/g}$)²⁰ and in surface sediment from
125 the Great Lakes (2.4 to 4.9 $\mu\text{g/g}$).²¹

126 *Concentrations in cleaning products.* Table S4 shows the QAC concentrations in 7 cleaning
127 and disinfecting products indicated as commonly used in the homes that were sampled. All three
128 QAC groups were detected in the analyzed products, but at widely varied concentrations. Products
129 1 and 2 had the highest $\sum\text{QAC}$ levels, reaching 16,600 and 1350 mg/L and accounting for 1.66 %
130 and 0.135 % by weight, respectively. These concentrations were 10-1000 times higher than those
131 in the rest of the products (2.52-156 mg/L). BACs were the predominant compounds in Products
132 1-3, contributing 83, 99, and 98% to the $\sum\text{QAC}$ concentrations (Figure S1). This contribution went
133 down to 0.4-23% in Products 4-7. It should be noted that Products 1 and 2 are included in the
134 EPA's list of disinfectants effective for the SARS-CoV-2.²²

135 *The effects of disinfecting practices on QAC levels in dust.* Seventy-two percent of
136 participants have indicated that they have increased the frequency and intensity of cleaning and
137 disinfecting procedures in their homes since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. Overall,
138 the Σ QAC concentrations in homes with increased disinfecting frequencies during the COVID-19
139 crisis (median 65.2 $\mu\text{g/g}$) were significantly higher than in homes that did not change their
140 disinfecting routine (median 21.7 $\mu\text{g/g}$, $p < 0.05$) (Figure 2B and Table S5), suggesting that the
141 intensified disinfecting practices can significantly increase exposure to QACs in the indoor
142 environment.

143 The Σ QAC levels in homes that reported cleaning and disinfecting from one to few times a
144 week were significantly higher than in homes that did not do weekly disinfecting or use
145 disinfecting chemicals ($p < 0.05$, Figure 2C). Overall, the homes with higher frequencies of
146 cleaning had the Σ QAC concentration twice as high as that in homes with less frequent cleaning
147 (medians 123 vs. 41.2 $\mu\text{g/g}$).

148 Ninety percent of households reported using a disinfecting product for their cleaning routine,
149 and more than 80% of these households regularly used Products 1, 2, and 7. Figure 3 compares the
150 average contributions of the three QAC groups, BACs, DDAC, and ATMACs, in these three
151 products and in dust samples from homes that regularly used only these three products. The
152 contributions of BACs, DDACs, and ATMACs in dust were similar to those in products (58, 24,
153 and 18% vs. 64, 14, and 22%, respectively). The similarity between the profiles in dust and
154 products suggests that disinfecting products frequently used in homes could be a significant source
155 of these compounds in these homes.

156 *Exposure assessment.* The estimated daily intakes (EDIs) of QACs via dust ingestion and
157 dermal absorption were calculated for toddlers and adults for the homes with increased disinfecting

158 frequency during the COVID-19 pandemic and for the homes where the disinfecting routine did
159 not change (Table 2). Overall, exposure to QACs for toddlers and adults via dust ingestion (9.31-
160 326 ng/kg body weight [bw]/day) was up to 1000 times higher than that via dermal dust absorption
161 (0.325-1.20 ng/kg bw/day), indicating that dust ingestion is the main exposure pathway to QACs.
162 The highest Σ QAC EDI (327 ng/kg bw/day) was observed for toddlers in homes with increased
163 disinfection. This EDI was about 10 times higher than that estimated for adults. The EDIs for
164 BACs and DDACs were well below the tolerable daily intake thresholds for these two compound
165 groups (1×10^5 ng/kg bw/day) established by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA).²³

166 This study had several limitations. The sample size was small for both dust and products
167 due to the efforts to finish the study during the time period of the COVID-19 pandemic. Only
168 limited information on disinfecting practices in homes was collected (e.g., information on the
169 disinfected area could not be obtained). In addition, the dust samples obtained from vacuum
170 cleaners could contain dust collected before the pandemic.

171 Nonetheless, this is the first study to assess human exposure to QACs in the indoor
172 environment. The timing of this study is important considering the increased use of disinfectants
173 due to the current COVID-19 pandemic. Our findings indicate that the indoor exposure to QACs
174 is widespread and significantly higher in households with increased disinfecting frequencies due
175 to the pandemic. The similarity between the profiles of QACs in products and dust collected from
176 the same households suggests that the disinfecting products are a significant source of these
177 compounds in homes. As the COVID-19 pandemic continues, the use of these compounds is
178 expected to increase worldwide. Furthermore, more intense disinfecting procedures are advised
179 for care facilities, schools, and other high-risk places, many of which serve populations most
180 vulnerable to these exposures. Exposure to QACs can exacerbate respiratory and reproductive

181 diseases, and our findings call for urgent research on risks associated with the increased exposure
182 to these chemicals.

183

184 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

185 We thank the participating households for donating dust. The MapMyEnvironment program
186 and related sampling effort is partially supported by NSF award ICER-1701132 to Filippelli and
187 the Environmental Resilience Institute, funded by Indiana University's Prepared for
188 Environmental Change Grand Challenge Initiative.

189

190 **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

191 Information on chemicals used in this study, instrumental methods, and quality control and
192 assurance measures; correlations among QACs in dust; QAC dust concentrations grouped based
193 on the disinfecting frequency; QAC concentrations and patterns in cleaning products.

194

195 **REFERENCES**

- 196 (1) U.S. CDC, Cleaning and disinfecting your facility, Available at:
197 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/disinfecting-building-facility.html>
198 (Accessed June 7, 2020). **2020**.
- 199 (2) Bettenhausen, C. A., A chemist's guide to disinfectants, Available at:
200 [https://cen.acs.org/safety/consumer-safety/chemists-guide-](https://cen.acs.org/safety/consumer-safety/chemists-guide-disinfectants/98/web/2020/05?utm_source=Newsletter&utm_medium=Newsletter&utm_campaign=CEN)
201 [disinfectants/98/web/2020/05?utm_source=Newsletter&utm_medium=Newsletter&utm_campaign](https://cen.acs.org/safety/consumer-safety/chemists-guide-disinfectants/98/web/2020/05?utm_source=Newsletter&utm_medium=Newsletter&utm_campaign=CEN)
202 [gn=CEN](https://cen.acs.org/safety/consumer-safety/chemists-guide-disinfectants/98/web/2020/05?utm_source=Newsletter&utm_medium=Newsletter&utm_campaign=CEN) (Accessed June 7, 2020). *Chem. Eng. News* **2020**.
- 203 (3) Makvandi, P.; Jamaledin, R.; Jabbari, M.; Nikfarjam, N.; Borzacchiello, A., Antibacterial
204 quaternary ammonium compounds in dental materials: A systematic review. *Dent. Mater.* **2018**, *34*,
205 851-867.
- 206 (4) Zhang, C.; Cui, F.; Zeng, G. M.; Jiang, M.; Yang, Z. Z.; Yu, Z. G.; Zhu, M. Y.; Shen, L. Q.,
207 Quaternary ammonium compounds (QACs): A review on occurrence, fate and toxicity in the
208 environment. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2015**, *518*, 352-362.
- 209 (5) Neu, T. R., Significance of bacterial surface-active compounds in interaction of bacteria

- 210 with interfaces. *Microbiol. Rev.* **1996**, *60*, 151-166.
- 211 (6) Mulder, I.; Siemens, J.; Sentek, V.; Amelung, W.; Smalla, K.; Jechalke, S., Quaternary
212 ammonium compounds in soil: Implications for antibiotic resistance development. *Rev. Environ.*
213 *Sci. Biotechnol.* **2017**, *17*, 159-185.
- 214 (7) LaKind, J. S.; Goodman, M., Methodological evaluation of human research on
215 asthmagenicity and occupational cleaning: A case study of quaternary ammonium compounds
216 ("quats"). *Allergy Asthma Clin. Immunol.* **2019**, *15*, 69.
- 217 (8) Pellizzari, E. D.; Woodruff, T. J.; Boyles, R. R.; Kannan, K.; Beamer, P. I.; Buckley, J. P.;
218 Wang, A.; Zhu, Y.; Bennett, D. H., Identifying and prioritizing chemicals with uncertain burden of
219 exposure: Opportunities for biomonitoring and health-related research. *Environ. Health Perspect.*
220 **2019**, *127*, 126001.
- 221 (9) Jardak, K.; Drogui, P.; Daghrir, R., Surfactants in aquatic and terrestrial environment:
222 Occurrence, behavior, and treatment processes. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. R.* **2016**, *23*, 3195-3216.
- 223 (10) Harrison, K. R.; Kappell, A. D.; McNamara, P. J., Benzalkonium chloride alters phenotypic
224 and genotypic antibiotic resistance profiles in a source water used for drinking water treatment.
225 *Environ. Pollut.* **2020**, *257*, 113472.
- 226 (11) Xian, Y.; Dong, H.; Wu, Y.; Guo, X.; Hou, X.; Wang, B., QuEChERS-based purification
227 method coupled to ultrahigh performance liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry
228 (UPLC-MS/MS) to determine six quaternary ammonium compounds (QACs) in dairy products.
229 *Food Chem.* **2016**, *212*, 96-103.
- 230 (12) Yu, L.; Malik, S.; Duncan, T. V.; Jablonski, J. E., High throughput quantification of
231 quaternary ammonium cations in food simulants by flow-injection mass spectrometry. *J. AOAC*
232 *Int.* **2018**, *101*, 1873-1880.
- 233 (13) Slimani, K.; Feret, A.; Pirotais, Y.; Maris, P.; Abjean, J. P.; Hurtaud-Pessel, D., Liquid
234 chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry multiresidue method for the analysis of quaternary
235 ammonium compounds in cheese and milk products: Development and validation using the total
236 error approach. *J. Chromatogr. A* **2017**, *1517*, 86-96.
- 237 (14) BfR opinion No 032/2012, Health assessment of benzalkonium chloride residues in food.
238 **2012**.
- 239 (15) BfR opinion No 027/2012, Health assessment of didecyltrimethylammonium chloride
240 (DDAC) residues in food. **2012**.
- 241 (16) Vykoukalová, M.; Venier, M.; Vojta, Š.; Melymuk, L.; Bečanová, J.; Romanak, K.; Prokeš,
242 R.; Okeme, J. O.; Saini, A.; Diamond, M. L.; Klánová, J., Organophosphate esters flame retardants
243 in the indoor environment. *Environ. Int.* **2017**, *106*, 97-104.
- 244 (17) Karásková, P.; Venier, M.; Melymuk, L.; Bečanová, J.; Vojta, Š.; Prokeš, R.; Diamond, M.
245 L.; Klánová, J., Perfluorinated alkyl substances (PFASs) in household dust in Central Europe and
246 North America. *Environ. Int.* **2016**, *94*, 315-324.
- 247 (18) LeBouf, R. F.; Virji, M. A.; Ranpara, A.; Stefaniak, A. B., Air and surface sampling method
248 for assessing exposures to quaternary ammonium compounds using liquid chromatography tandem
249 mass spectrometry. *Ann. Work Expo. Health* **2017**, *61*, 724-736.
- 250 (19) Guo, Y.; Kannan, K., Comparative assessment of human exposure to phthalate esters from
251 house dust in China and the United States. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2011**, *45*, 3788-3794.
- 252 (20) Li, X.; Brownawell, B. J., Quaternary ammonium compounds in urban estuarine sediment
253 environments - A class of contaminants in need of increased attention? *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2010**,
254 *44*, 7561-7568.
- 255 (21) Pati, S. G.; Arnold, W. A., Comprehensive screening of quaternary ammonium surfactants

256 and ionic liquids in wastewater effluents and lake sediments. *Environ. Sci. Process Impacts* **2020**,
257 22, 430-441.

258 (22) U.S. EPA, List N: Disinfectants for use against SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19), Available at:
259 <https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/list-n-disinfectants-use-against-sars-cov-2-covid-19>
260 (Accessed June 20, 2020). **2020**

261 (23) European Food Safety Authority, Reasoned opinion on the dietary risk assessment for
262 proposed temporary maximum residue levels (MRLs) of didecyldimethylammonium chloride
263 (DDAC) and benzalkonium chloride (BAC). *EFSA Journal* **2014**, 12, 3675.

264

265

266 **Table 1.** Detection frequencies (DF,%), minimum (min), maximum (max), mean (with their
 267 standard errors [SE]), and median concentrations of QACs in residential dust collected during the
 268 outbreak of the COVID-19 outbreak in the United States ($\mu\text{g/g}$; $n = 40$), and a contribution (%) of
 269 each QAC to the ΣQAC concentrations. MDL: method detection limit.
 270

QACs	DF	Min	Max	Mean \pm SE	Median	Contribution
<i>BACs</i>						
C6-BAC	98	<MDL	0.084	0.009 \pm 0.003	0.004	0.01
C8-BAC	100	0.0022	7.58	0.460 \pm 0.211	0.058	0.1
C10-BAC	100	0.0005	0.787	0.137 \pm 0.032	0.054	0.1
C12-BAC	100	0.244	181	25.6 \pm 5.77	12.6	29
C14-BAC	100	0.760	154	20.4 \pm 5.04	9.55	22
C16-BAC	100	0.203	75.6	8.20 \pm 2.45	3.17	7.3
C18-BAC	100	0.061	34.8	3.74 \pm 1.27	1.16	2.7
ΣBAC	100	1.66	421	58.5 \pm 13.7	27.1	56
<i>DDACs</i>						
C8-DDAC	100	0.0148	20.2	3.55 \pm 0.769	1.63	3.7
C10-DDAC	100	0.0219	32.8	6.75 \pm 1.18	4.30	10
C12-DDAC	98	<MDL	2.91	0.205 \pm 0.087	0.047	0.1
C14-DDAC	100	0.0002	0.462	0.048 \pm 0.015	0.016	0.04
C16-DDAC	100	0.0031	4.24	0.619 \pm 0.117	0.374	0.9
C18-DDAC	100	0.0192	33.1	6.25 \pm 1.33	3.47	7.9
ΣDDAC	100	0.0595	68.9	17.4 \pm 2.66	12.3	26
<i>ATMACs</i>						
C8-ATMAC	95	<MDL	0.507	0.105 \pm 0.0215	0.057	0.1
C10-ATMAC	93	<MDL	6.76	0.628 \pm 0.187	0.266	0.6
C12-ATMAC	100	0.0281	13.1	2.32 \pm 0.491	1.25	2.9
C14-ATMAC	100	0.0034	2.51	0.388 \pm 0.0718	0.275	0.6
C16-ATMAC	100	0.0116	61.3	7.90 \pm 1.76	4.59	11
C18-ATMAC	100	0.0096	9.80	1.62 \pm 0.321	0.841	1.9
ΣATMAC	100	0.235	66.5	12.9 \pm 2.10	8.78	18
ΣQAC	100	1.95	531	88.9 \pm 16.7	58.9	100

271

272

273 **Table 2.** Estimated daily intakes (EDIs; ng/kg body weight [bw]/day) of each QAC group via dust
 274 ingestion and dermal dust absorption for toddlers and adults in homes with the increased vs. not
 275 changed disinfecting frequencies during the COVID-19 pandemic.

	Increased		Not changed	
	Toddlers	Adults	Toddlers	Adults
<u>Dust ingestion</u>				
Σ BAC	188	16.1	56.8	4.87
Σ DDAC	68.2	5.84	31.4	2.69
Σ ATMAC	60.3	5.16	15.7	1.35
Σ QAC	326	27.9	109	9.31
<u>Dermal absorption</u>				
Σ BAC	0.561	0.693	0.170	0.210
Σ DDAC	0.204	0.252	0.094	0.116
Σ ATMAC	0.180	0.222	0.047	0.058
Σ QAC	0.974	1.20	0.325	0.401
<u>Total exposure (dust ingestion + dermal absorption)</u>				
Σ BAC	188	16.8	57.0	5.08
Σ DDAC	68.4	6.09	31.4	2.80
Σ ATMAC	60.4	5.39	15.8	1.41
Σ QAC	327	29.1	109	9.71

276

277




Figure 1. Chemical structures of the three main QAC groups.




Figure 2. The Σ QAC concentrations ($\mu\text{g/g}$) in dust collected from homes: A) during ($n = 40$) and before ($n = 6$) the COVID-19 pandemic; B) with increased ($n = 29$) vs. not changed ($n = 11$) disinfecting frequency during the COVID-19 pandemic; and C) more frequent (one to few times per week; $n = 26$) vs. less frequent (less than once a week or do not use disinfecting chemicals; $n = 13$; three outliers were omitted) cleaning. Concentrations are shown as boxplots, representing the 25th and 75th percentiles; black lines represent the median; and the whiskers represent the 10th and 90th percentiles. The asterisks represent the statistical difference at $p < 0.05$ based on one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA).




Figure 3. Comparison of the average contributions (%) of the three QAC groups to the Σ QAC concentrations in house dust and in the only three disinfecting products (Products 1, 2, and 7) regularly used in these homes.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Indoor Exposure to Commonly Used Disinfectants during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Guomao Zheng,¹ Gabriel Filippelli^{2,3}, Amina Salamova^{1*}

¹ Paul H. O'Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405

² Center for Urban Health, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

³ Environmental Resilience Institute, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405

Chemicals and reagents. Nineteen native standards, including benzyldimethylhexylammonium chloride (C6-BAC), benzyldimethyloctylammonium chloride (C8-BAC), benzyldimethyldodecylammonium chloride (C10-BAC), benzyldimethyldodecylammonium chloride (C12-BAC), benzyldimethyltetradecylammonium chloride (C14-BAC), benzyldimethylhexadecylammonium chloride (C16-BAC), stearyldimethylbenzylammonium chloride (C18-BAC), dioctyldimethylammonium bromide (C8-DDAC), didecyldimethylammonium bromide (C10-DDAC), didodecyldimethylammonium bromide (C12-DDAC), dimethylditetradecylammonium bromide (C14-DDAC), dihexadecyldimethylammonium bromide (C16-DDAC), dimethyldioctadecylammonium bromide (C18-DDAC), octyltrimethylammonium chloride (C8-ATMAC), decyltrimethylammonium bromide (C10-ATMAC), dodecyltrimethylammonium chloride (C12-ATMAC), tetradecyltrimethylammonium chloride (C14-ATMAC), hexadecyltrimethylammonium chloride (C16-ATMAC), and octadecyltrimethylammonium chloride (C18-ATMAC) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA). Two labeled standards, including benzyl-

dimethyldodecylammonium-d7 chloride (d₇-C12-BAC) and benzyldimethyltetradecylammonium-d7 chloride (d₇-C14-BAC) were obtained from Toronto Research Chemicals (Toronto, ON, Canada). All solvents and chemicals used in this study were HPLC grade or higher.

Instrumental analysis. An ultra-performance liquid chromatograph coupled to a triple-quadrupole mass spectrometer (Agilent 1290 Infinity II UPLC – 6470 QQQ-MS) in the positive electrospray ionization (ESI+) mode was used for the analysis. The UPLC separation was carried out using an Acquity UPLC BEH C₁₈ column (50 mm, 2.1 mm i.d., 1.7 μm thickness, Waters, Milford, MA) heated to 30 °C. The mobile phase consisted of 0.1% formic acid in water (*A*) and 0.1% formic acid in acetonitrile (*B*). The gradient was as follows: 10% *B* for 0.5 min initially, then increased to 100% *B* at 6 min and held for 4 min, returned to 10% *B* at 10.5 min and equilibrated for 3.5 min after every run. The injection volume and flow rate were 5 μL and 0.4 mL/min, respectively. The nebulizer, gas flow, gas temperature, capillary voltage, sheath gas temperature, and sheath gas flow were set to be 25 psi, 10 L/min, 300 °C, 3500 V, 350 °C, and 12 L/min, respectively. A multiple reaction monitoring (MRM) mode was used for data acquisition. The optimized MRM transitions, fragmentors, and collision energies are presented in Table S1.

Quality assurance and quality control. Six procedural blanks and six spiked samples were extracted with the samples. The absolute recoveries for the spiked samples (mean ± standard error) were 113 ± 5, 117 ± 3, 110 ± 4% for BACs, DDACs, and ATMACs, respectively. The recovery of the surrogate standard d₇-C12-BAC was 118 ± 4%. Blanks constituted less than 0.1% of sample levels. Blank levels and method detection limits for each QAC are included in Table S2. All data were blank-corrected by subtracting blank levels from sample levels.

Exposure assessment. Estimated daily intake rates (ng/kg body weight [bw]/day via dust ingestion) were calculated using Equation 1:

$$EDI_{\text{Dust ingestion}} (\text{ng/kg bw/d}) = \frac{(C_{\text{dust}} \times I_{\text{rate}}) \times T}{bw} \quad (1)$$

where C_{dust} is the concentration of a chemical in dust (ng/g), I_{rate} is the ingestion rate (0.06 and 0.03 g/day for toddlers and adults, respectively),¹ T is the time spent at home (assumed to be 1 day),² and bw is the mean body weight (12 and 70 kg for toddlers and adults, respectively).²

EDIs via dermal dust absorption were calculated using Equation 2:

$$EDI_{\text{Dermal dust absorption}} (\text{ng/kg/d}) = \frac{(C_{\text{dust}} \times BSA \times DAS \times FA) \times T}{bw} \quad (2)$$

where C_{dust} is the concentration of a chemical in dust (ng/g), BSA is the exposed body surface area (2564 and 4615 cm² for toddlers and adults, respectively),¹ DAS is the dust adhered to skin (0.01 and 0.04 mg/cm² for toddlers and adults, respectively),¹ FA is the fraction of contaminant absorbed by skin (0.007, unitless),¹ T is the time spent at home (assumed to be 1 day),² and bw is the mean body weight (12 and 70 kg for toddlers and adults, respectively).²

Table S1. The optimized MRM transitions, fragmentors, and collision energies for target analytes.

Compound	Abbreviation	Precursor ion [M-Cl/Br] ⁺	Fragmentor (volts)	Product ions (m/z)	Collision energy (volts)
Benzyltrimethylhexylammonium chloride	C6-BAC	220.2	88	128.1	17
				91	29
Benzyltrimethyloctylammonium chloride	C8-BAC	248.2	103	91	29
				65.1	77
Benzyltrimethyldecylammonium chloride	C10-BAC	276.3	103	91.1	33
				184	21
Benzyltrimethyl dodecylammonium chloride	C12-BAC	304.3	113	91	41
				212	25
Benzyltrimethyl tetradecylammonium chloride	C14-BAC	332.3	122	91.1	41
				240	25
Benzyltrimethyl hexadecylammonium chloride	C16-BAC	360.4	146	91.1	41
				268	25
Searyltrimethylbenzylammonium chloride	C18-BAC	388.39	127	296.3	29
				91	45
Dioctyltrimethylammonium bromide	C8-DDAC	270.3	156	158.2	29
				71.1	33
Didecyltrimethylammonium bromide	C10-DDAC	326.4	151	186	33
				71.1	37
Didodecyltrimethylammonium bromide	C12-DDAC	382.4	181	214	37
				71.1	41
Dimethylditetradecylammonium bromide	C14-DDAC	438.5	151	242	41
				71.1	49
Dihexadecyltrimethylammonium bromide	C16-DDAC	494.6	151	270	49
				71.1	53
Dimethyldioctadecylammonium bromide	C18-DDAC	550.6	175	298	53
				71.1	57
Octyltrimethylammonium chloride	C8-ATMAC	172.2	132	85.1	21
				71.1	25
Decyltrimethylammonium bromide	C10-ATMAC	200.2	127	85.1	21
				71.1	25
Dodecyltrimethylammonium chloride	C12-ATMAC	228.3	137	85.1	25
				71.1	25
Tetradecyltrimethylammonium chloride	C14-ATMAC	256.3	142	85.1	29
				71.1	29
Hexadecyltrimethylammonium chloride	C16-ATMAC	284.3	132	85.1	29
				71.1	33
Octadecyltrimethylammonium chloride	C18-ATMAC	312.4	142	85.1	33
				71.1	33
Benzyltrimethyl dodecylammonium-d7 chloride (Surrogate standard)	d7-C12-BAC	311.34	122	98.1	37
				212	25
(Benzyl-d7)dimethyl tetradecylammonium chloride (Internal standard)	d7-C14-BAC	339.38	127	98.1	41
				70.1	97

Table S2. Blank levels and method detection limits (MDL), $\mu\text{g/g}$.

QACs	Blanks	MDL
C6-BAC	0.0003	0.0003
C8-BAC	0.0003	0.0001
C10-BAC	0.0001	0.0000
C12-BAC	0.0305	0.0025
C14-BAC	0.0046	0.0008
C16-BAC	0.0067	0.0006
C18-BAC	0.0006	0.0002
C8-DDAC	0.0004	0.0005
C10-DDAC	0.0131	0.0018
C12-DDAC	0.0039	0.0005
C14-DDAC	0.0004	0.0002
C16-DDAC	0.0007	0.0005
C18-DDAC	0.0040	0.0005
C8-ATMAC	0.0009	0.0015
C10-ATMAC	0.0001	0.0001
C12-ATMAC	0.0023	0.0017
C14-ATMAC	0.0156	0.0022
C16-ATMAC	0.0012	0.0009
C18-ATMAC	0.0005	0.0003

Table S3. Pearson correlation coefficients for correlations among QAC concentrations in dust ($n = 40$).

	C6- BAC	C8- BAC	C10- BAC	C12- BAC	C14- BAC	C16- BAC	C18- BAC	C8- DDAC	C10- DDAC	C12- DDAC	C14- DDAC	C16- DDAC	C18- DDAC	C8- ATMAC	C10- ATMAC	C12- ATMAC	C14- ATMAC	C16- ATMAC	C18- ATMAC
C6- BAC	1.000	.728**	.811**	.669**	.646**	.755**	.664**	.404*	.581**	.530**	.445**	.431**	.730**	.600**	.790**	.386*	0.309	.527**	.654**
C8- BAC		1.000	.710**	.621**	.583**	.634**	.512**	.396*	0.298	.357*	0.299	0.288	.549**	.470**	.575**	.369*	.413*	.381*	.505**
C10- BAC			1.000	.829**	.800**	.854**	.805**	.570**	.651**	.599**	0.323	0.231	.771**	.593**	.757**	.391*	.545**	.493**	.658**
C12- BAC				1.000	.941**	.866**	.850**	.727**	.701**	.642**	.462**	0.275	.756**	.629**	.663**	.579**	.632**	.603**	.563**
C14- BAC					1.000	.921**	.801**	.722**	.710**	.625**	.398*	0.210	.719**	.631**	.658**	.605**	.613**	.575**	.591**
C16- BAC						1.000	.752**	.664**	.764**	.682**	.412*	0.263	.706**	.632**	.680**	.561**	.542**	.568**	.771**
C18- BAC							1.000	.830**	.685**	.573**	0.317	0.176	.893**	.805**	.711**	.443**	.461**	.454**	.519**
C8- DDAC								1.000	.667**	.612**	.398*	0.230	.796**	.874**	.457**	.548**	.612**	.491**	.493**
C10- DDAC									1.000	.907**	.554**	.418*	.608**	.580**	.492**	.625**	.522**	.702**	.576**
C12- DDAC										1.000	.686**	.533**	.547**	.517**	.423*	.611**	.567**	.697**	.583**
C14- DDAC											1.000	.814**	.371*	0.320	0.217	.485**	.512**	.782**	.361*
C16- DDAC												1.000	0.313	0.276	0.175	0.323	.367*	.771**	0.184
C18- DDAC													1.000	.903**	.770**	.396*	.443**	.505**	.548**
C8- ATMAC														1.000	.629**	.431**	.421*	.421*	.516**
C10- ATMAC															1.000	.364*	0.270	.332*	.633**
C12- ATMAC																1.000	.664**	.628**	.425**
C14- ATMAC																	1.000	.626**	.384*
C16- ATMAC																		1.000	0.322
C18- ATMAC																			1.000

* represents significance at $p < 0.05$; ** represents significance at $p < 0.01$.

Table S4. QAC concentrations in cleaning products commonly used in participants' homes (mg/L). MDL: method detection limit.

	Product 1	Product 2	Product 3	Product 4	Product 5	Product 6	Product 7
<u>BACs</u>							
C6-BAC	283	0.0446	0.0171	0.0116	<MDL	0.0179	<MDL
C8-BAC	206	1.86	0.018	0.0146	0.0123	0.0039	<MDL
C10-BAC	304	0.384	0.0513	0.0052	0.0037	<MDL	<MDL
C12-BAC	6240	208	16.7	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL
C14-BAC	4240	567	76.7	0.77	<MDL	<MDL	0.208
C16-BAC	2480	425	49	0.138	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL
C18-BAC	60.9	141	10.2	0.327	<MDL	<MDL	0.0352
ΣBAC	13800	1340	153	1.27	0.016	0.0218	0.243
<u>DDACs</u>							
C8-DDAC	255	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL
C10-DDAC	400	1.20	0.924	0.704	0.446	0.524	0.476
C12-DDAC	249	0.597	0.319	0.261	0.103	0.242	0.206
C14-DDAC	207	<MDL	<MDL	0.0156	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL
C16-DDAC	164	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL
C18-DDAC	170	1.16	0.211	0.259	0.172	0.125	0.127
ΣDDAC	1440	2.96	1.45	1.24	0.721	0.891	0.809
<u>ATMACs</u>							
C8-ATMAC	271	<MDL	0.126	0.33	<MDL	0.22	<MDL
C10-ATMAC	221	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL
C12-ATMAC	359	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL
C14-ATMAC	71.5	4.35	1.93	1.75	3.01	1.79	1.44
C16-ATMAC	146	0.228	0.0494	0.446	0.292	0.0252	0.0284
C18-ATMAC	246	0.103	<MDL	0.563	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL
ΣATMAC	1310	4.68	2.11	3.09	3.31	2.04	1.47
ΣQAC	16600	1350	156	5.6	4.04	2.95	2.52

Table S5. Median QAC concentrations ($\mu\text{g/g}$) in dust samples collected from Indiana homes before the COVID-19 pandemic ($n = 6$), and in homes with increased ($n = 29$) vs. not changed ($n = 11$) disinfection frequencies during the COVID-19 pandemic. Percent contributions of each QAC to the total QAC concentrations are also included.

	Before COVID-19		Increased		Not changed	
	Median	Contribution	Median	Contribution	Median	Contribution
<i>BACs</i>						
C6-BAC	0.0014	0.01	0.00422	0.01	0.00161	0.01
C8-BAC	0.0237	0.1	0.0843	0.2	0.0256	0.2
C10-BAC	0.0166	0.1	0.0708	0.1	0.0234	0.2
C12-BAC	5.71	21	15	27	6.10	40
C14-BAC	4.31	16	12.4	23	2.38	16
C16-BAC	1.23	4.6	4.23	7.7	0.827	5.5
C18-BAC	0.524	2.0	1.28	2.3	0.233	1.6
Σ BAC	14	43	37.5	59	11.4	55
<i>DDACs</i>						
C8-DDAC	1.4	5.3	2.18	4.0	0.42	2.8
C10-DDAC	5.22	20	5.96	11	0.956	6.3
C12-DDAC	0.0367	0.1	0.0796	0.15	0.0178	0.12
C14-DDAC	0.0117	0.04	0.0249	0.05	0.00718	0.05
C16-DDAC	0.59	2.2	0.494	0.9	0.143	1.0
C18-DDAC	2.91	11	3.48	6.3	1.45	9.6
Σ DDAC	10.4	32	13.6	22	6.27	30
<i>ATMACs</i>						
C8-ATMAC	0.0194	0.1	0.0576	0.1	0.0233	0.2
C10-ATMAC	0.14	0.5	0.312	0.6	0.0844	0.6
C12-ATMAC	1.52	5.7	1.4	2.6	0.693	4.6
C14-ATMAC	0.173	0.6	0.382	0.69	0.0972	0.7
C16-ATMAC	2.23	8.3	6.3	11	1.32	8.8
C18-ATMAC	0.639	2.4	1.32	2.4	0.271	1.8
Σ ATMAC	8.32	26	12.1	19	3.15	15
Σ QAC	35.9	100	65.2	100	21.7	100




Figure S1. The pattern of QACs in cleaning products collected from participants' homes (%).

References

- (1) EPA, U. S., Exposure Factors Handbook. *2011 Edition (Final) (Washington, DC) 2011.*
- (2) Stubbings, W. A.; Schreder, E. D.; Thomas, M. B.; Romanak, K.; Venier, M.; Salamova, A., Exposure to brominated and organophosphate ester flame retardants in U.S. childcare environments: Effect of removal of flame-retarded nap mats on indoor levels. *Environ. Pollut.* **2018**, *238*, 1056-1068.