Effects of disinfectants on inactivation of mold spores relevant to the food industry: a review

Karim Rigalma

Effects of disinfectants on inactivation of mold spores relevant to the food industry: a review.

Vincent VISCONTI, Emmanuel COTON, Karim RIGALMA and Philippe DANTIGNY*

Univ Brest, Laboratoire Universitaire de Biodiversité et Ecologie Microbienne, F-29280 Plouzané, France

*Corresponding author : Philippe DANTIGNY
Laboratoire Universitaire de Biodiversité et Ecologie Microbienne,
Parvis Blaise-Pascal, Technopôle Brest-Iroise
29280 Plouzané, France
Tel : +33 (0)2.90.91.51.11
E-mail : philippe.dantigny@univ-brest.fr

Keywords: hygiene, fungicide, biocide, fungi, predictive mycology

Abstract

Due to the dissemination of airborne conidia and spores, molds can contaminate various surfaces. In the food industry sector, their presence and development can have health and economic implications. In order to control these undesirable microorganisms, various approaches can be used but the main one relies on the use of disinfectants. The objective of this review is to report the existing studies on the effect of various disinfectant molecules (i.e., sodium hypochlorite, chlorine dioxide, ethanol and other alcohols, hydrogen peroxide, peracetic acid, and quaternary ammonium compounds) on the inactivation of fungal spores. These studies were sorted depending on the targeted fungal species. Noteworthy, in the food industry, four log and three log reductions are required to claim a fungicidal activity for suspension (European Standard 1650, 2019) and surface (European Standard 13697/IN1, 2019) treatments, respectively. Most of the presented studies concerned *Penicillium* and *Aspergillus* species (44 and 31% of the literature, respectively). In general, for a given disinfection procedure, ascospores were more resistant than conidia, and *Aspergillus* conidia were more resistant than *Penicillium* ones. However, the variability of encountered molds (e.g. species, strains, physiological state) and disinfection procedures (e.g. molecules, concentrations, contact time) affected the efficacy of disinfectants.

1. Introduction

Quality is a major issue for food industries as various hazards can affect food products. Among microbiological hazards, fungal contamination is a major spoilage source of many food products such as fruits, vegetables, bakery and dairy products. Mold development leads not only to modification of organoleptic properties but can also have safety implications in the case of a mycotoxigenic species. Consequently, food spoilage by fungi is synonymous of economic losses for producers, and food waste and health risk for the consumer (Bryden, 2007; Coton and Dantigny, 2019; Dagnas and Membré, 2013; Sengun *et al.*, 2008). As for the medical sector, pathogenic strains of *Candida* and *Aspergillus* species are the primary cause of hospital-acquired fungal infections (Seeliger and Schröter, 1984), and in recent years these infections have been recognized as serious threats to immunocompromised patients (Bodey *et al.*, 1992; Morrison *et al.*, 1994; Wildfeuer *et al.*, 1998). Moreover, other mold-associated infections have constantly increased over the last decades (e.g. mucormycosis, Morin-Sardin et al., 2017).

In order to prevent microbial contamination, food manufacturers mainly use disinfectants. Due to the presence of at least one active ingredient with antimicrobial activity, disinfectants are microbiocidal products. Antimicrobial activity is defined as the ability of a biocide to reduce the number of viable cells. More generally, disinfectants have a broad activity range, such as a bactericidal, virucidal, sporicidal, yeasticidal and fungicidal activity.

Fungicidal activity is determined by means of the log reduction of the number of viable mold spores. This is a key factor in the choice of a disinfectant. This activity is evaluated according to specific standards drawn up by international or national agencies, and specifying standardized test methods (van Klingeren *et al.*, 1998). In Europe, standards for assessing fungicidal activity have been established by the European Committee for Standardization (CEN/TC 216). These standards indicate various experimental factors such as

66 the species and strains, the culturing and harvesting methods, the test procedure (contact time,
67 concentrations, temperature...), the enumeration method as well as the criteria for assessing
68 the antimicrobial activity of the tested biocide.

69 The fungicidal effect of disinfectants is based on the inactivation of reference
70 microorganisms, *Candida albicans* (ATCC 10231) and *Aspergillus brasiliensis* (ATCC
71 16404), either by the suspension test, the carrier test or the airborne room disinfection
72 procedure (Table 1). The European Standard 1275 (2006) entitled "*Quantitative suspension*
73 *test for the evaluation of the basic fungicidal activity of antiseptics and chemical*
74 *disinfectants*" consists in demonstrating a basic activity of the test product in optimal
75 conditions of use. A suspension test is described to establish whether the test product has a
76 fungicidal activity based on reducing by at least 4 log the reference microorganisms. The
77 European Standard 1650 (2019) entitled "*Quantitative suspension test for the evaluation of*
78 *the fungicidal or yeasticidal activity of antiseptics and chemical disinfectants used in the food*
79 *industry, in industry, in domestic and community areas*", assesses the activity of the
80 disinfectant under practical conditions of use. A suspension is tested in the presence of an
81 interfering substance simulating clean or dirty conditions. The European Standard EN
82 13697/+A1 (2019) entitled "*Chemical antiseptics and disinfectants - Quantitative test of a*
83 *non-porous surface for the evaluation of the bactericidal and/or fungicidal activity of*
84 *chemical disinfectants used in the food industry, in industry, in domestic and community*
85 *sectors. Test method without mechanical action and requirements*" describes a test on a non-
86 porous surface intended to assess the efficacy of the disinfectant molecule diluted in hard
87 water. The ability of the latter to reduce, by at least 3 log, the reference microorganisms after
88 15 min or less exposure, at a temperature between 18°C and 20°C is also evaluated in the
89 presence of an interfering substance simulating clean or dirty conditions.

The surface test is by far the most important, challenging and representative of the tests of disinfectant efficacy. With the exception of drinking water, the surface test is more relevant than the suspension test because it is truer to practical conditions and theoretically, microorganisms attached to a surface will be more resistant than those in a suspension, therefore this presents the greatest challenge. The quantitative surface test evaluates test suspensions of bacteria and fungi in a solution of interfering substances, designed to simulate clean and dirty conditions, which are inoculated onto a test surface and dried (Sandle, 2017). More recently, the European Standard 17272 (2020), described a test to disinfect by an automated process the surfaces of the overall area including the external surfaces of the equipment contained in rooms. This standard aims at simulating practical conditions of airborne disinfection in a laboratory situation.

There are several sanitizing chemical compounds approved for use on food contact surfaces, such as hypochlorites, chlorine dioxide, iodophors, peroxides, ethanol, quaternary ammonium. Regardless of the chemical, the stock solution must be diluted to a specific concentration to ensure maximum efficacy. The list of authorized compounds may vary with time and according to countries. Final concentrations in use for some sanitizing compounds approved in the Canada and in the US are listed Table 2. Some compounds, such as ethanol, do not require any rinsing. For the other compounds, the maximum residue levels that remain in the food product should be evaluated as acceptable by the safety authorities in Canada. In Europe, disinfectants (biocides) used in the food industry are controlled by a range of legislation, but two are key in determining the level of disinfectant that can be taken up by foodstuffs after the disinfectant's legitimate use. Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 (2005) on maximum residue levels of pesticides in or on food and feed of plant and animal origin governs the use of pesticide residues. Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 (2012), concerning the

making available on the market and use of biocidal products, governs the use of biocides for the purpose of disinfection in the food hygiene sector.

Despite the importance of fungal contamination in the food industry, in the medical environment, and in domestic and community areas, to the best of our knowledge, the effect of disinfectants on molds spores was not reviewed. With the notable exception of *Aspergillus fumigatus*, and *Trichophyton mentagrophytes*, this review was concerned with mold species relevant to the food industry. *A. fumigatus* is the most common species implicated in all pulmonary syndromes and some contaminated food could be a potential source of exposition in immunosuppressed patients (Bouakline *et al.*, 2000). In Canada, *T. mentagrophytes* is the reference organism for assessing the fungicidal efficacy of a disinfectant in the medical area (Gaulin et al., 2011). In this context, this review reported the effects of various biocides against the inactivation of more than sixty different mold species. This work synthesized for the main disinfectants used, their chemical nature, mode of action, efficacy on mold spores through studies published over the past twenty years.

In the context of this review, disinfectant efficacy was usually assessed by means of the log reduction in viable spores, $\log(N/N_0)$, where N was the number of survivors after treatment, and N_0 the initial load of spores which, according to the European standards, should be in the range 1.5-5 10^7 CFU/ml. When the N_0 value was not stated in a study, the effect of the disinfectant could not be evaluated and the publication was not used, as for example Roberts and Reymond's (1994) study.

In many studies, disinfection treatments were applied to fruits, vegetables, or grains artificially contaminated by sprayed spore suspensions. The efficacy of treatments were not assessed by enumerating the number of survivors but by determining a decay number (Karabulut et al., 2004, 2005) or a contamination percentage (Andrews, 1996). None of these responses could be correlated to the number of survivors after treatment. Accordingly, this

kind of studies was also discarded. In water applications, the disinfectant effectiveness was often expressed in terms of the Ct (concentration x $time_{reaction}$) value needed to inactivate a certain percentage of the population (Pereira et al., 2013). Therefore, in all studies reported in Table 3, the impact of the treatments was always expressed in terms of log reduction. When no survivors were detected after treatment, the log reduction was indicated as greater than log N. Most studies assessed the fungicide effect of disinfectants for a given exposure duration, but studies examining inactivation kinetics were scarce.

2. Chlorine compounds

2. 1. Generalities

Chlorine compounds are a family of biocides consisting of a chlorine atom responsible for oxidative activity. The main disinfectants in this chemical group are hypochlorous acid, hypochlorite ion, chlorine and chlorine dioxide. Hypochlorous acid, hypochlorite ion, and chlorine are referred to as free (Fukuzaki, 2006; Leidholdt, 2000) or active (EU regulation N°528/2012, 2017) chlorine. Formation of the latter compounds results from the decomposition of sodium hypochlorite in water, 1% w/w sodium hypochlorite being equivalent to 0.96% w/w active chlorine (EU regulation N°528/2012, 2017). Other chlorine sources correspond, for example, to sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid or calcium hypochlorite after dissolution in water. The first solution of sodium hypochlorite was produced by the French chemist Claude Berthollet in the 18th century under the name “Eau de Javel” and its antimicrobial properties were discovered in the 19th century by the French chemist Antoine Germain Labarraque (Mupparapu and Kothari, 2019). Chlorine compounds are widely used in the food industry to disinfect surfaces or in hospitals to disinfect material, but also in the treatment of drinking water and some ready to eat food such as salads (Beuchat and Ryu, 1997; Gómez-López et al., 2009; Jeffrey, 1995; Okull et al., 2006; Rossman et al., 1994). The

main factor that influences the antimicrobial activity of chlorine compounds is the presence of soiling/organic load which will have a negative impact by reacting with chlorine (Boothe, 1998; Kotula et al., 1997). Neutral pH has a positive impact on antifungal activity of sodium hypochlorite solution by promoting the formation of hypochlorous acid (pKa 7.54) which is more active than the hypochlorite ion predominant in alkaline solution (pH 9-11) (Boothe, 1998; Leidholdt, 2000; McDonnell and Russell, 1999). Chlorine concentrations are usually expressed in ppm (mg/l) for disinfecting water and in percentage for sanitization of food industry surfaces.

2. 2. Mode of action

Antimicrobial activity of a sodium hypochlorite solution is due to the oxidative action of hypochlorous acid and hypochlorite ion on cellular components. These compounds are able to react with multiple biomolecules such as lipids, amino acids, proteins, peptides and nucleic acids. Therefore, chlorine compounds are able to target many cellular structures and compounds such as cell wall, cell and mitochondrial membrane, enzymes as well as DNA (Fukuzaki, 2006). Available chlorine inhibits the metabolism by oxidation of thiol functions or oxidation and chloramination of amino groups present in the membrane and cytoplasmic enzymes (Denyer and Stewart, 1998). In addition to disrupting the metabolism, hypochlorous acid has been shown to induce the production of Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) with a lethal effect on cells (Dukan et al., 1999). Sodium hypochlorite and chlorine dioxide have also been shown to exert a genotoxic effect as observed on the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* yeast (Buschini, 2004). Electron microscopic examination showed that *A. fumigatus* conidia exposed to sodium hypochlorite solution were smaller and smoother than the untreated conidia, with loss of surface structures and some surface padding compared to untreated conidia (Martyny et al., 2005).

189

190 *2. 3. Antifungal activity of sodium hypochlorite*

191 Bundgaard-Nielsen and Nielsen (1996) tested the fungicidal efficacy of 3% sodium
192 hypochlorite on twenty-five fungal contaminants. After 10 minutes exposure, inactivation
193 values ranged from 1.7 to more than 5.2 log. Twenty-one isolates exhibited more than 4 log
194 inactivation. Ascospores, except those of *Eurotium repens* (=*Aspergillus pseudoglaucus*)
195 showed a greater resistance than conidia to sodium hypochlorite. For example, *Monascus*
196 *ruber* and *Neosartorya pseudofischeri* (=*Aspergillus thermomutatus*) ascospores showed
197 inactivation of 2.9 and 4.0 log, respectively. In contrast to these ascospores, all conidia, with
198 the exception of one *Penicillium commune* isolate (1.7 log inactivation), exhibited more than
199 4 log reduction. However, the fungicidal activity of sodium hypochlorite can vary within the
200 same species. At a concentration of 0.3 % for a 10 min exposure, the inactivation of
201 *Penicillium roqueforti* ranged from 0.5 to 4.5 log depending on the considered strain (n=2).

202 A low sodium hypochlorite concentration at relatively short exposure times was
203 sufficient to ensure effective inactivation of *Aspergillus niger* and *P. roqueforti*, both widely
204 distributed contaminants in the food industry. Indeed, three minutes exposure to 0.5% sodium
205 hypochlorite solution were sufficient to completely inactivate (about 6 log inactivation) all *A.*
206 *niger* isolates (*n*=5) and less than 1 minute was sufficient for all tested *P. roqueforti* isolates
207 (*n*=5) (Korukluoglu et al., 2006).

208 A lower pH, and the presence of certain non-ionic surfactants, may increase the
209 antifungal activity of sodium hypochlorite. Okull et al. (2006) showed that a *Penicillium*
210 *expansum* suspension exposed for 5 min to sodium hypochlorite at 50 ppm, induced 1.9 log
211 and 0.5 log decrease in viable conidia at pH 6.3 ± 0.2 and pH 8.5 ± 0.2, respectively. At the
212 lower pH, the addition of nonionic surfactant such as Span 20, Tween 20 or Tween 80 at

213 0.01% (v/v) led to the absence of viable spores. At the higher pH, only Span 20 and Tween 20
214 at 0.1% gave a significant reduction of 2.4 log.

215 Furthermore, it has been observed that, at concentrations lower than 0.1%, the
216 fungicidal activity of sodium hypochlorite decreases sharply. The contact times required for
217 the complete inactivation of *Penicillium brevicompactum* conidia at sodium hypochlorite
218 concentrations of 0.053% was 30 min as compared to 4 and 2 min for 0.299 and 0.525 %
219 concentrations, respectively (Ebling, 2008). A contact time of 15 min to 1% chlorine allowed
220 total inactivation of *Aspergillus ochraceus* (Gupta et al., 2002). The fungicidal efficacy of
221 sodium hypochlorite on *Aspergillus flavus*, *A. fumigatus* and *A. niger* isolates was further
222 evaluated by Mattei et al. (2013). The recommended concentration of 0.4% sodium
223 hypochlorite for 72h was sufficient to inactivate one third of the *Aspergilli* (n=18). Another
224 third required 0.8 and 1.6%, while the remaining third exhibited survivors for 1.6%. These
225 authors concluded that sodium hypochlorite was the least effective disinfectant against
226 *Aspergillus* spp. as compared to chlorhexidine-cetrimide, benzalkonium chloride and a
227 chlorophenol derivative. It should be underlined that 72h exposure time exceeds the
228 maximum time that can be allowed in the food industries, even for a complete disinfection.

229 Frison et al. (2015) showed that a decrease in pH from 9 to 6.3 reduced the contact
230 time required to achieve 4 log inactivation for five isolates of *Aspergillus* section Nigri. For a
231 700 mg/l (0.07%) sodium hypochlorite solution, according to the considered strain, the
232 contact time required to reach 4 log at pH 9 and at pH 6.3, ranged from 16.2 to 28.8 min, and
233 from 9.5 to 14.7 min, respectively. However, at higher sodium hypochlorite concentrations,
234 the effect of pH on the contact time required to reach 4 log inactivation was less noticeable.
235 For 1300 mg/l (0.13%) sodium hypochlorite, the contact time associated with 4 log
236 inactivation ranged from 1.1 to 1.2 min at pH 6.3 and 1.4 to 2 min at pH 9.

Pereira et al. (2013) investigated the impact of pH and temperature on the efficacy of two free chlorine concentrations (1 and 3 mg/l) to inactivate *A. fumigatus*, *Aspergillus terreus*, *Cladosporium cladosporioides*, *Cladosporium tenuissimum*, *Penicillium citrinum*, *Penicillium griseofulvum* and *Phoma glomerata*, molds which are found in different source waters. Efficacy was evaluated by means of an inactivation rate constant expressed in min^{-1}, the greater the inactivation rate, the more efficient the inactivation was. At 21°C, a pH decrease from 7 to 6 increased the inactivation rate about 8-fold for *P. glomerata*. This was explained by the higher proportion of hypochlorous acid (HOCl), a more powerful disinfectant, than hypochloride ion (OCl^-) at pH 6. An increase from 1 mg/l to 3 mg/l increased also the inactivation rates about 3 fold for *Aspergilli*, *C. cladosporioides*, and *P. citrinum*. A lower impact was observed for *C. tenuissimum*, *P. griseofulvum* and *P. glomerata*. Eventually, at 1 mg/l, the impact of the type of water on inactivation was highlighted. Inactivation rates were about 2-8 fold greater in laboratory grade water than in settled water (i.e. obtained for decantation of treated wastewater). At pH 7, a temperature decrease from 21°C to 4°C led to a decrease in inactivation rate of about 2-4 fold only depending on the considered species. In contrast to this study, less than one log reduction difference was observed between *A. brasiliensis* conidia submitted to sodium hypochlorite (0.5 and 1% for 5-15 min) at 10 and 40°C (Stefanello et al., 2021).

Drinking water contaminated with *A. fumigatus*, *Aspergillus versicolor* and *Penicillium purpurogenum* was also tested using sodium hypochlorite and monochloramine solutions (Ma and Bibby, 2017). Disinfectant concentrations and contact times were in the range 1-4 mg/l, and 0-60 min respectively. The Ct values needed to obtain 3 log inactivation ranged from 48.99 to 194.7 $mg.min.l^{-1}$ and from 90.33 to 531.3 $mg.min.l^{-1}$, for sodium hypochlorite and monochloramine, respectively. *A. versicolor* and *P. purpurogenum* isolated

261 from a drinking water system were more resistant than an *A. fumigatus* clinical isolate to both
262 disinfectants.

263 The efficacy of sodium hypochlorite solution (0.1%, 0.5% and 1% of active chlorine)
264 on *A. brasiliensis* as well as on fungal food spoilers, namely *C. cladosporioides*, *P. commune*,
265 *Penicillium polonicum* and *P. roqueforti*, was tested by Bernardi et al. (2018) according to the
266 EN 13697 standard (2001). Mold conidia were fixed on stainless steel coupons in the
267 presence of an interfering solution, then sodium hypochlorite solutions were applied for 15
268 minutes. Under these conditions, sodium hypochlorite was the most effective disinfectant
269 against all tested species compared to the other disinfectants tested in the study (i.e.
270 benzalkonium chloride, biguanide, peracetic acid, and quaternary ammonia). Active chlorine
271 0.1% was very effective against *C. cladosporioides* with more than 4 log inactivation and
272 effective against *A. brasiliensis* with 3 log inactivation. However, the same concentration
273 showed insufficient fungicidal activity against the three tested *Penicillium* species (2 log
274 reduction). On the contrary, 0.5% active chlorine was very effective against all species with
275 more than 4 log inactivation. The greatest sodium hypochlorite concentration tested in this
276 study, 1%, was above the concentrations usually allowed for use in food industries.

277 Potential intraspecific response heterogeneity to sodium hypochlorite exposure was
278 evaluated on several strains of *Aspergillus pseudoglaucus* (n=2), *Hyphopichia burtonii* (n=3),
279 *Penicillium paneum* (n=3) and *P. roqueforti* (n=3), (Bernardi *et al.*, 2019). Exposure to 0.2%
280 active chlorine for 15 min had very limited effect against all tested strains with a mean
281 inactivation value of 1.37 log for *A. pseudoglaucus* and 2.30 log for *P. paneum*. At 0.2%
282 active chlorine, the greatest difference in inactivation within the same species was observed
283 for *P. roqueforti* with a 0.54 log inactivation difference between the most resistant strain (1.74
284 log) and the most sensitive one (2.28 log). However, amongst all the concentrations tested
285 (0.01%, 0.1% and 0.2%), the greatest difference in inactivation was obtained at 0.1% active

chlorine on *P. paneum* with a 1.03 log difference between the most resistant strain (0.04 log reduction) and the most sensitive strain (1.07 log reduction). Although sodium hypochlorite is used in a relatively wide concentration range from 0.01 to 2% depending on the target mold, cleanliness conditions and desired level of hygiene, active chlorine concentrations lower than or equal to 0.2% do not guarantee an inactivation greater than 3 log on treated surfaces. Sodium hypochlorite and biguanide were the least effective, reducing less than 3 log from initial control, not being the most suitable agents for the control of toxigenic fungi (*Aspergilli*) in food industries (Gonçalves Lemos *et al.*, 2020).

On the other hand, disinfectant treatments of three *Penicillium* species isolated from fruit juices were evaluated according to the EN 13697 standard (2015) on stainless steel, in the absence or presence of sucrose as interfering substance (Nierop Groot et al., 2019). Remarkably, for *Penicillium buchwaldii* conidia, chlorine from hypochlorite inactivation was enhanced in the presence of sucrose (1.8 log reduction with sucrose compared to 0.9 log in the absence without).

Evaluation of sodium hypochlorite fungicidal activity has been extended to other types of material than the traditional steel coupon. The spores of *Alternaria alternata*, *A. niger*, *Cladosporium herbarum*, *Mucor bainieri*, *Penicillium chrysogenum*, *Stachybotrys chartarum* and *T. mentagrophytes* were inactivated by 2.4% sodium hypochlorite to undetectable levels in glazed and unglazed ceramic carriers. Test organisms were non-culturable in 10/10 trials, after 5-min contact times in glazed ceramic carriers, and after 10 min in unglazed ceramic carriers, representing a >3-log10 to >5-log10 reduction, depending on the mold type (Reynolds et al., 2012).

2. 4. Antifungal activity of chlorine dioxide

In their study, Bundgaard-Nielsen and Nielsen (1996) found that 5% chlorine dioxide had a fungicidal efficacy similar to 3% sodium hypochlorite on their selection of target fungi (see §2.3). For 10 minutes exposure, inactivation values ranged from 2.7 log to more than 5.2 log. Eleven out of 20 isolates exhibited more than 4 log inactivation. All isolates exhibited more than 3 log reduction except *Penicillium caseifulvum* (2.7 log).

The impact of pH, temperature and humic acid concentration on the fungicidal activity of chlorine dioxide (ClO_2) in the range 0.5-3.0 mg/l was assessed on *Cladosporium* sp., *Penicillium* sp., and *Trichoderma* sp. (Wen et al., 2017). The inactivation rate constants for chlorine dioxide, 2 mg/l, were 5, 26 and 17 fold those obtained for chlorine, 2 mg/l, for *Cladosporium* sp., *Penicillium* sp., and *Trichoderma* sp., respectively. Inactivation rate constants were not significantly affected by pH 6 and 7. In contrast to pH, inactivation rate constants decreased significantly by lowering temperature from 27 to 10°C (by 25% for *Penicillium* sp. and 50% for *Cladoporium* sp. and *Trichoderma* sp.). While the inactivation rate constants did not vary significantly in the 0-2 mg/l humic acid range, inactivation rates at 0.4 mg/l were half those obtained at 0.2 mg/l. Overall, by increasing susceptibility order, the species were ranked *Penicillium*<*Trichoderma*<*Cladosporium*.

As shown in the study of Nierop Groot et al. (2019), chlorine dioxide remained effective against *Penicillium* spp. at low temperatures. At 7°C, for 5 min contact time to 500 ppm chlorine dioxide an inactivation greater than 5 log was shown for *Penicillium bialowiezense*, *P. buchwaldii* and *P. expansum*. In comparison, the inactivation obtained by chlorine was 2.5 log in the case of *P. bialowiezense* and less than 1 log for the two other species. In another study (Okull et al. 2006), *P. expansum* exposed to chlorine dioxide at 3 ppm for 5 min exposure exhibited 3.7 log inactivation.

Regarding the effect of chlorine dioxide on ascospore-producing species, 10 min exposure to 5% chlorine dioxide led to more than 4.5, more than 4 and 3.3 log inactivation for

335 *E. repens* (=*A. pseudoglaucus*), *M. ruber* and *N. pseudofischeri* (=*A. thermomutatus*),
336 respectively (Bundgaard-Nielsen and Nielsen, 1996). Dijksterhuis et al., (2018) also evaluated
337 the fungicidal effect of this biocide on heat-resistant ascospores of *Aspergillus fischeri*,
338 *Paecilomyces variotii*, *Paecilomyces niveus* and *Talaromyces macrosporus* (=*Penicillium*
339 *macrosporum*) which were either dormant or activated by 80°C heat treatment for 5 min. For
340 the first three mentioned species, the two kind of ascospores were inactivated after 500 and
341 1000 ppm treatments for 5 min. Only *T. macrosporus* (=*P. macrosporum*) ascospores
342 survived up to 500 ppm, but full eradication of this species (i.e. inactivation ≥ 5 log) was
343 observed after 30 min. During viability assessment experiments, heat activated ascospores of
344 this species showed larger colonies than dormant ascospores, thus suggesting an increased
345 resistance of heat activated ascospores to the disinfectant.
346
347 *2. 5. Antifungal activity of sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid*
348 In their 1996 study, Bundgaard-Nielsen and Nielsen also tested the fungicidal efficacy
349 of sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid at 0.37 g/l. After 10 minutes exposure, inactivation values
350 ranged from 1.3 log to more than 5.2 log according to the considered target fungi (see §2.3),
351 seven isolates exhibiting more than 4 log inactivation. Eight strains were particularly resistant,
352 namely two *P. commune* isolates (1.7 and 3.7 log reduction), *P. caseifulvum* (1.9 log
353 reduction), *Penicillium discolor* (1.9 log reduction), *Penicillium nalgiovense* (1.7 log
354 reduction), *P. roqueforti* (0.9 log reduction) and *Penicillium carneum* (1.7 log reduction) as
355 well as *E. repens* (= *A. pseudoglaucus*) ascospores (0.3 log reduction).
356
357 **3. Alcohols**
358 *3. 1. Generalities*

359 Alcohols used as disinfectants correspond to ethyl alcohol (or ethanol), isopropyl
360 alcohol (or isopropanol) and n-propanol. However, ethanol is the most commonly used
361 molecule in this family. Alcohols are water soluble molecules consisting of a polar hydroxyl
362 function and a hydrocarbon tail. Alcohols have long been used for their antimicrobial activity
363 and the first evaluations of their efficacy can be traced back to 1881 with the work of Robert
364 Kock (Price, 1939). In the food industry, the use of alcohols as disinfectant has the advantage
365 of being safe for the user (food-grade) and of not leaving any residue on the treated surface
366 due to their rapid evaporation. Alcohols can be sprayed, fumigated or applied through
367 impregnated wipes. Alcohols, like ethanol, are formulated in relatively strong concentrations.
368 Their antimicrobial activity is optimal in the range 60-90% (Boyce, 2018a; Jeffrey, 1995;
369 McDonnell and Russell, 1999).
370
371 *3. 2. Mode of action*
372 Alcohols act on the cell membrane and cytoplasmic proteins. These molecule toxicity
373 depends on their aliphatic chain and hydrophobicity. This is why small chain alcohols, like
374 ethanol, are toxic at high concentrations. The mode of action of ethanol on fungal cells was
375 reviewed by Dao and Dantigny (2011). Ethanol molecules will interact with cell membrane
376 lipids at the lipid-water interface leading to increased polarity and decreased cell permeability
377 to polar compounds. Cell death at high ethanol concentrations is believed to be associated
378 with an increase of the fluidity and then the disruption of their cell membrane followed by
379 leakage of cellular compounds (Ingram and Buttke, 1985; Jones and Greenfield, 1987;
380 Tesnière, 2019, Russell, 2003). Ethanol has several deleterious effects on the integrity of the
381 cell membrane. At high concentrations, ethanol dissolves membrane lipids and denature
382 proteins on the membrane leading to destruction of the cell membrane (Bacílková, 2006;
383 Ingram and Buttke, 1985). However, it seems that thinning of the membranes also takes place

384 at low concentrations of ethanol. At higher ethanol concentrations (> 20%), ethanol would
385 transform the phospholipid bilayer into an interdigitated phospholipid phase (Henderson and
386 Block, 2014; Simon and McIntosh, 1984). In the interdigitated phospholipid phase, the
387 membrane lipids of the phospholipid bilayer are distributed over a single layer leaving the
388 terminal methyl group of the acyl chains exposed. This configuration is a consequence of the
389 interactions between the hydroxyl group of the short alcohol chains (C <3) with the polar
390 heads of the phospholipids and their non-polar half with the acyl chains of the phospholipids.
391 Since the nonpolar part of these alcohols is smaller than the acyl part of phospholipids, empty
392 spaces are created in the inner part of the membrane. These spaces will be filled by lipids
393 from the opposite side leading to the formation of an interdigital phase (Simon and McIntosh,
394 1984; Weber and de Bont, 1996). Interdigital phase membranes have a lower thickness and
395 greater permeability than the natural state of the membrane.

396 The modification of the biophysical properties of membranes also disrupts the
397 function of membrane proteins. In addition, alcohols can interact directly with proteins and
398 denature them. Due to their ability to diffuse across the plasma membrane, alcohols are
399 responsible for the denaturation of cytoplasmic proteins. Protein denaturation is believed to be
400 an important factor in the fungicidal activity of alcohols (Boyce, 2018). Given the role of
401 proteins in the proper functioning of cells, their denaturation affects the metabolism and
402 absorption of nutrients in the cell (Ingram and Buttke, 1985). Moreover, ethanol has been
403 reported to damage mitochondrial membranes (Dao and Dantigny, 2011) and DNA (Ibeas and
404 Jimenez, 1997). Mitochondria are thought to have a close role in ethanol-induced death in S.
405 cerevisiae (Carmona-Gutierrez et al., 2012).

406

407 *3. 3. Antifungal activity of ethanol*

Bundgaard-Nielsen and Nielsen (1996) tested the fungicidal efficacy of 70% ethanol on target species (see §2.3.). For 10 minutes exposure, inactivation values ranged from 1.3 to more than 5.2 log and eleven isolates exhibited more than 4 log inactivation. *M. ruber* ascospores were the most resistant spores (1.3 log reduction) thus suggesting that ascospores had a greater resistance than conidia to ethanol. The age of ascospores seems to have an influence on the fungicidal activity of ethanol as 110-day *M. ruber* ascospores were more resistant to 70% ethanol than 21-day ascospores (3.5 log difference). An important difference in inactivation of approximately 4 log was observed between the most sensitive isolate and the most resistant *P. roqueforti* isolate, indicating intraspecific susceptibility heterogeneity.

Concentration and contact time are important factors that explain the antifungal activity of ethanol. However, other factors can affect the efficacy of ethanol. Dao et al. (2008) showed that temperature, water activity and the mode of application impacted *P. chrysogenum*, *Penicillium digitatum* and *Penicillium italicum* inactivation by ethanol. In this study, *P. digitatum* was the most sensitive to ethanol, while *P. chrysogenum* was the most resistant mold. Increasing the ethanol preparation water activity from 0.7 to 0.9 a_w resulted in a greater inactivation of *P. chrysogenum*. For this species, ethanol solutions were more effective than ethanol vapors. For the more sensitive species, namely *P. digitatum* and *P. italicum*, vapor ethanol was more effective at 30°C than at 10°C. The experimental condition "0.7 a_w, 30°C, liquid application for 4 days, 10% w/w ethanol" was the most drastic tested condition and ensured total inactivation of the three tested species with inactivation values ranging from 3.19 log to 5.78 log.

Biological factors of the target mold had also a great effect on the fungicidal activity of ethanol. Dao and Dantigny, (2009) tested the effect of ethanol vapors at 0.30 and 0.45 kPa on hydrated and dry-harvested conidia of *P. chrysogenum*, *P. digitatum* and *P. italicum*. After 24 hours exposure, all dry-harvested conidia remained viable, while the hydrated conidia had

433 mean inactivation values of approximately 1, 3.5 and 2.5 log for *P. chrysogenum*, *P.*
434 *digitatum* and *P. italicum*, respectively. The fungicidal efficacy of ethanol vapors on dry-
435 harvested conidia of *P. chrysogenum*, *P. digitatum* and *P. italicum* was further evaluated by
436 Dao et al. (2010). For a 24-hour exposure, 0.7 kPa ethanol vapor pressure inactivated 4 log *P.*
437 *digitatum* and *P. italicum* conidia, but only 3.2 log *P. chrysogenum* conidia. While an ethanol
438 vapor pressure of 1.5 kPa achieved an inactivation of about 4.5 log and more than 5 log for *P.*
439 *chrysogenum* and the two other species, respectively. Fungicidal activity of ethanol was also
440 impacted by the water activity of the spore production medium (Dao and Dantigny, 2009).
441 Conidia produced from mycelium grown at 0.85 a_w were more resistant to 0.67 kPa ethanol
442 vapors than conidia produced at 0.99 a_w. After 48 h exposure, 6.5, 5.1 and 5.9 log inactivation
443 were obtained for conidia produced at 0.99 a_w for *P. chrysogenum*, *P. digitatum* and *P.*
444 *italicum*, respectively. Conidia produced at reduced a_w (0.90-0.95) required 120 h contact
445 time to reach 4.5 log inactivation for *P. chrysogenum* and *P. digitatum*, a 6 log reduction was
446 observed at 98 h and 120 h exposure for *P. italicum* conidia produced at 0.95 and 0.90 a_w,
447 respectively. The greatest resistance of dry-harvested conidia produced at a reduced water
448 activity was also observed on four isolates of *P. commune* exposed to a 70% ethanol (Visconti
449 et al., 2020). For 1 min exposure, regardless of the isolates, only dry-harvested conidia
450 produced at a_w 0.950 exhibited survivors. Survival after 2 min exposure (and even 3 min) for
451 this physiological state was only observed for *P. commune* UBOCC-A-116003. For this
452 strain, the impact of the physiological state was greater than 1.54 log reduction between dry-
453 harvested conidia produced at 0.950 a_w, that exhibited survivors after 1 min treatment, and the
454 3 other kinds of conidia that were all inactivated.
455
456 *3. 4. Antifungal activity of isopropanol*

457 According to Bundgaard-Nielsen and Nielsen (1996), 70% isopropanol was less
458 effective than 70% ethanol to ensure the total inactivation of the great majority of the target
459 species (see §2.3.). After 10 minutes exposure, inactivation values ranged from 0.9 to more
460 than 5.2 log, and eleven isolates exhibited inactivation values greater than or equal to 4 log. *E.*
461 *repens* (=*A. pseudoglaucus*) and *M. ruber* ascospores, but also *P. roqueforti* conidia, were
462 more resistant to 70% isopropanol than the other selected isolates with inactivation values of
463 2.3, 0.9 and 3.5 log, respectively.

464 Korukluoglu et al. (2006) reported a significant intraspecific variability in the
465 resistance of *P. roqueforti* conidia to an isopropanol-based disinfectant. While, three isolates
466 were completely inactivated (approximately 6 log reduction) after 2 to 8 minute treatments,
467 two others could survive for more than 60 min exposure. In contrast to *P. roqueforti*, lower
468 intraspecific heterogeneity was noticed for *A. niger,* 6 log reduction being obtained for
469 treatments ranging from 10 to 25 min depending on the considered isolates.

470

471 **4. Peroxides**

472 *4. 1. Generalities*

473 Peroxides are chemical species characterized by the presence of two covalently bond
474 oxygen atoms (R-O-O-R'). In disinfection, the most widely used peroxides are hydrogen
475 peroxide (H_2O_2), peracetic acid (CH_3COOOH) and ozone (O_3). These disinfectants, which are
476 powerful oxidizers, can be used in liquid or gaseous form by misting, nebulization or
477 vaporization. Hydrogen peroxide and peracetic acid are both sensitive to soils, such as organic
478 matter, and more effective at temperatures greater than 25°C. Unlike peracetic acid, hydrogen
479 peroxide is more effective at alkaline pH albeit more unstable (Stanga, 2010). Due to its lower
480 sensitivity to organic load and peroxidases, peracetic acid is considered more effective than
481 hydrogen peroxide (McDonnell and Russell, 1999). Peracetic acid has a limited impact on the

environment and human health due to its decomposition into water and acetic acid (Alvaro et al., 2009; Lee and Huang, 2019; Taverner et al., 2018), thus making peracetic acid an alternative of interest to chlorine compounds that can form chloramines.

4. 2. Mode of action

Hydrogen peroxide and peracetic acid produce ROS which are powerful oxidizing agents of proteins by acting on their thiol groups (Denyer, 1995). Hydrogen peroxide can act on other cellular components such as ribosomes, cell and mitochondrial membranes as well as DNA (McDonnell and Russell, 1999; Qin et al., 2011; Russell, 2003). In *P. expansum*, Qin et al., (2011) showed that the accumulation of ROS following exposure to hydrogen peroxide was responsible for oxidative damage on the proteins of the mitochondrial membrane leading to the collapse of the membrane potential.

4. 3. Antifungal activity of hydrogen peroxide

Bundgaard-Nielsen and Nielsen (1996) reported that 10 min exposure to 3% hydrogen peroxide had almost no effect on *P. roqueforti* conidia and *E. repens* (=*A. pseudoglaucus*) ascospores (0.3 and 0 log reduction, respectively). As shown by Martin and Maris (2012), *Absidia corymbifera*, *A. versicolor*, *Geotrichum candidum*, *Penicillium cyclopium* and *Scopulariopsis brevicaulis* exhibited 3 log inactivation at 12.5, 1.71, 0.50, 2.34, 5.51% for 15 min exposure. Formic, propionic, acetic, oxalic, lactic and sulfuric acids had synergistic activity with hydrogen peroxide. In most cases (92%), the addition of these organic acids reduced the effective fungicide concentrations by more than 4 fold. Among these six acids, only three retained this synergy when tested in the presence of an interfering agent. They were corresponded to formic acid, against *A. corymbifera*, *G. candidum* and *S. brevicaulis*,

propionic acid against *A. corymbifera,* and *A. versicolor* and acetic acid against *A. corymbifera.*

4. 4. Antifungal activity of peracetic acid

The effect of 0.3% peracetic acid was the same as 3% hydrogen peroxide on *P. roqueforti* and *E. repens* (=*A. pseudoglaucus*) (Bundgaard-Nielsen and Nielsen, 1995). In contrast to these authors who reported 0.3 log inactivation in *P. roqueforti*, 5 to 16 min exposure to 0.3% peracetic acid inactivated 6 log of the latter species (Korukluoglu et al., 2006). The same authors indicated a stronger resistance of *A. niger* than *P. roqueforti* to peracetic acid as more than 55 min were necessary to obtain a 6 log reduction in *A. niger* conidia. According to Frison et al. (2015), 6.2-13.8 min exposure to 0,6% peracetic acid decreased viable *A. niger* conidia by 4 log.

The effect of paracetic acid was also evaluated on conidia inoculated on stainless steel coupons (Bernardi et al, 2018). A 15 min treatment by 0.15% peracetic acid was not sufficient to inactivate 4 log *P. roqueforti* conidia. These authors showed that 1.5% peracetic acid succeeded in inactivating more than 4 log of *C. cladosporioides, P. commune*, *P. polonicum* and *P. roqueforti* conidia but failed to inactivate 3 log of *A. brasiliensis* conidia. The same authors extended their study on coupons to other molds i.e., *A. pseudoglaucus*, *P. paneum* and *P. roqueforti,* and disinfectants (benzalkonium chloride, biguanide and quaternary ammonium, all tested at 0.3, 2.5 and, 5%) (Bernardi et al., (2019). At 3%, peracetic acid was more effective than the other disinfectants at their highest concentrations to inactivate all the tested species. *P. paneum* and one *P. roqueforti* were the most sensitive species to 3% peracetic acid, exhibiting more than 4 log reduction, while *A. pseudoglaucus* was the most resistant. Eventually, it was shown that *A. brasiliensis* proved less resistant than ascospore-forming molds tested, i.e., *Chaetomium globosum*, *Talaromyces bacillisporus* (=*Penicillium*

bacillisporum) and *Aspergillus hiratsukae* (Scaramuzza et al. 2020). In contrast to benzalkonium chloride, a clearer higher antifungal efficacy of peracetic acid at higher temperatures was demonstrated (Stefanello *et al.*, 2021). When studying the efficacy of electrolyzed water and sanitizers against heat resistant molds, Stefanello *et al*. (2020) found out that peracetic acid at the maximum concentration of 1% was the best antifungal agent against *Paecilomyces variotii*, *Paecilomyces niveus*, *Paecilomyces fulvus*, *Paecilomyces* sp. and *Aspergillus neoglaber*. Peracetic acid showed the best inactivation of *Aspergillus* from Circumdati section spores (Gonçalves Lemos *et al.*, 2020).

5. Quaternary ammonium compounds

5. 1. Generalities

Quaternary ammonium compounds (QACs) are cationic surfactants. The cationic part consists of a central positively charged nitrogen atom covalently bond with 4 alkyl or aryl groups. The cationic part is most often linked to a chlorine or a bromide to form a QAC salt. Among the most widely used QACs, one can mention benzalkonium chloride, twin-chained QAC dimethyl dodecyl ammonium chloride or bromide (DDAC or DDAB, 12), cetyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB) and cetylpyridinium chloride (CPC) (Jennings et al., 2015). QACs are usually formulated with nonionic detergents to increase detergency activity. The presence of a high concentration of calcium and magnesium ions in water, soiling matter (Jeffrey, 1995) or lipids in organic matter (Boothe, 1998) has a negative impact on QAC efficacy. (Jeffrey, 1995). QACs are not compatible with soaps or ordinary anionic detergents; if the latter are used for cleaning, they must be rinsed off before applying QACs otherwise the disinfectants will see its efficacy largely impacted. QACs are more effective in alkaline conditions than in acid ones and a rise in temperature increases their activity. At the

555 usage dilutions, QACs are usually non-corrosive to surfaces but strong concentrations can
556 corrode mild steel or iron (Jeffrey, 1995).
557
558 *5. 2. Mode of action*
559 QACs are membrane disruptors, membrane disorganization would be due to
560 electrostatic interactions between the QACs and the cell membrane lipids (potentially the
561 phospholipids) at the intramembrane region level. This leads to the leakage of low molecular
562 weight content (potassium ions, inorganic phosphates, amino acids, etc.), destruction of
563 proteins and nucleic acid as well as lysis of the cell wall following the action of autolytic
564 enzymes (Jennings et al., 2015; McDonnell and Russell, 1999; Russell, 2003).
565
566 *5. 3. Quaternary ammonium compounds antifungal activity*
567 In their extensive disinfectant study, Bundgaard-Nielsen and Nielsen (1996) tested the
568 fungicidal efficacy of four QAC-based disinfectants on the same previously mentioned 23
569 isolates (see § 2.3). For a 1.5% benzalkonium chloride-based disinfectant, after 10 minutes
570 exposure, inactivation ranged from 1 to more than 5.2 log according to the considered isolate.
571 Fourteen isolates exhibited inactivation greater than or equal to 4 log, namely *E. repens* (=*A.*
572 *pseudoglaucus*) (> 4.5 log), *M. ruber* (> 4.1 log) and *N. pseudofischeri* (=*A. thermomutatus*)
573 (> 4.5 log) ascospores. One out of two *A. versicolor*, *P. discolor*, *P. roqueforti* and *P.*
574 *roqueforti* were characterized by log reduction greater than 4 log. Exposure to a 2% N-alkyl-
575 dimethyl-ammonium chloride-based disinfectant for 10 minutes led to inactivation values
576 ranging from 2.1 to more than 4.2 log (for *S. brevicaulis*). Overall *Penicillia* were less
577 resistant than *Aspergilli*. Exposure to 2% dodecyl- + dodecyl-benzyldimethyl-ammonium
578 chloride-based disinfectant (same exposure time), inactivated from 1.5 log (*A. versicolor*) to
579 more than 5.2 log spores *(A. flavus*, *A. niger* and *Penicillium crustosum*). The latter species

were also resistant to 10 minutes exposure to a mixture of benzalkonium chloride, formaldehyde, glutaraldehyde and 2% cetalkonium chloride-based disinfectant.

Korukluoglu et al., (2006) tested the sensitivity of five *A. niger* isolates and five *P. roqueforti* isolates to three commercial QAC disinfectants based on alkyl-dimethyl-benzylammonium chloride (product A, 2%), on didecyl-dimethyl-ammonium chloride (product B, 0.5 and 1%), and on benzalkanium chloride (product C, 0.5, 1 and 1.5%). Product B was the less efficient, at 1%, 8-21 min and more than 45 min were necessary to completely inactivate *P. roqueforti* and *A. niger*, respectively. Product A and product C, at 1%, completely inactivated *P. roqueforti* and *A. niger* in maximum contact times of 3 and 5 min, respectively. Benzalkonium chloride concentrations required to inactivate 2.7 log conidia were 0.25-2% for *A. flavus*, less than 0.125-0.5% for *A. fumigatus* and 0.25% for *A. niger* (Mattei et al., 2013).

Benzalkonium chloride 2% demonstrated a poor efficacy (< 2 log reduction) when applied to *A. brasiliensis*, *C. cladosporioides*, *P. commune*, *P. polonicum* and *P. roqueforti* for 15 min (Bernardi et al., 2018). However, a maximum efficacy, more than 4 log reduction, was achieved for *C. cladosporioides* by increasing the concentration up to 3.5%, but a concentration of 5% failed to reach this maximum efficacy for all the other species. This observation was latter extended to *A. pseudoglaucus* (Bernardi et al., 2019). Another un-specified quaternary ammonium at 5% reached this maximum efficacy for *C. cladosporioides*, *P. commune* and *P. polonicum* (Bernardi et al., 2018), but not for *A. pseudoglaucus*, *P. paneum* and some *P. roqueforti* isolates (Bernardi et al., 2019). Benzalkonium chloride and iodine were the most effective sanitizers to eliminate *Aspergillus* from the Flavi and Nigri section (Gonçalves Lemos *et al.*, 2020).

6. Conclusions

In the agri-food-industry context, cleaning and sanitation are crucial steps to ensure both microbial safety (absence of pathogens) and quality (absence of spoilers) in the final product. As for the sanitation aspect, there is a wide variety of active substances that can be used and that are characterized by different chemical structure, mode of action, physicochemical properties and interactions with the environment. Moreover, each active substance can be found in a variety of commercial disinfectants that differ in their formulation. An effective disinfectant should be broad spectrum (i.e. eliminating Gram-positive and –negative bacteria as well as yeast and molds), act quickly, active even in the presence of organic load, non-aggressive on the treated surface, safe for the environment, the operator, the consumer and should not form by-products (Stanga, 2010). On one hand, the efficacy of a disinfectant can be improved by modifying the physico-chemical properties of the disinfectant solution or by adding co-formulants that are not always disclosed by manufacturers (Okull et al., 2006; Dao, 2008; Pereira et al., 2013; Wen et al., 2017). On the other hand, presence of soiling substances significantly decreases the efficacy of disinfectants. The effectiveness of disinfectants generally increases at higher concentrations. Stefanello et *al.*, (2020) reported that the lowest concentration specified in various sanitizers label was ineffective in most cases (94%), thus suggesting that the greatest concentrations should be preferred. However, increasing disinfectant concentrations is synonymous for a greater consumption of product at an increased cost and leads to more time and water are necessary to rinse the disinfectant. Then, some biocides, such as chlorine compounds, release by-products (e.g. chloramines) that can have impacts on the consumer health and the environment. In this context, although efficient, potentially deleterious substances should be substituted for more health and environmentally friendly products, provided that these disinfectants are fungicidal enough.

Although *A. brasiliensis* (ATCC 10231) is the standard strain for assessing antifungal efficiency of sanitizers, the European Standards suggested to extend these assessments to other species. This review suggested not to use *C. cladosporioides* as an additional species because this species was found to be very sensitive to many disinfectants. Disinfectants should be tested against microorganisms present in each industry and veterinary/medicine places, and selected according to their ability to inactivate the most resistant species. The choice of the sanitizer is not easy, because disinfectant molecules perform differently not only depending on the considered species but also on the considered isolate within the same species; therefore, intraspecific resistance heterogeneity should also be taken into consideration. Real contaminations are due to highly hydrophobic airborne conidia. For this reason, liquid sanitizers contain non-ionic surfactant to speed-up the action of the fungicidal molecules. However, airborne conidia remain dry, whereas conidia used in standard assays are wet in spore suspensions. As demonstrated, hydration has a significant effect on the physiological state of fungal spores and their susceptibility to disinfectant, therefore this aspect should also be taken into consideration. Overall, the choice of a multi-target efficient disinfectant is not an easy task as numerous abiotic and biotic factors can impact its efficacy.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the French Dairy Interbranch Organization (CNIEL) (Moisibio Project, 2019_00621) and the French Association for Research and Technology (ANRT) (CIFRE 2018/0036).

References

Alvaro, J.E., Moreno, S., Dianez, F., Santos, M., Carrasco, G., Urrestarazu, M., 2009. Effects of peracetic acid disinfectant on the postharvest of some fresh vegetables. Journal of Food Engineering 95, 11–15.

Andrews, S., 1996. Evaluation of surface disinfection procedures for enumerating fungi in foods: a collaborative study. International Journal of Food Microbiology 29, 177–184.

Bacílková, B., 2006. Study on the effect of butanol vapours and other alcohols on fungi. Restaurator 27, 186-199.

Bernardi, A.O., Stefanello, A., Garcia, M.V., Parussolo, G., Stefanello, R.F., Moro, C.B., Copetti, M.V., 2018. Efficacy of commercial sanitizers against fungi of concern in the food industry. LWT - Food Science and Technology 97, 25–30.

Bernardi, A.O., Stefanello, A., Lemos, J.G., Garcia, M.V., Copetti, M.V., 2019. Antifungal activity of commercial sanitizers against strains of *Penicillium roqueforti*, *Penicillium paneum*, *Hyphopichia burtonii*, and *Aspergillus pseudoglaucus*: Bakery spoilage fungi. Food Microbiology 83, 59–63.

Bernardi, A.O., Stefanello, A., Garcia, M.V., Copetti, M.V., 2021. The control of cheese and meat product spoilage fungi by sanitizers: *In vitro* testing and food industry usage. LWT - Food Science and Technology 144, 111204.

Beuchat, L.R., Ryu, J.H., 1997. Produce handling and processing practices. Emerging Infectious Diseases 3, 459–465.

Bodey, G., Bueltmann, B., Duguid, W., Gibbs, D., Hanak, H., Hotchi, M., Mall, G., Martino, P., Meunier, F., Milliken, S., *et al*. 1992. Fungal infections in cancer patients: an

676 international autopsy survey. European Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious
677 Diseases 11, 99-109.
678 Boothe, H.W., 1998. Antiseptics and disinfectants. Veterinary Clinics of North America:
679 Small Animal Practice 28, 233–248.
680 Bouakline, A. Lacroix, C., Roux, N., Gangneux, J-P., Derouin, F. 2000. Fungal contamination
681 of food in hematology units. Journal of Clinical Microbiology 38, 4272-4273.
682 Boyce, J.M., 2018. Alcohols as surface disinfectants in healthcare settings. Infection Control
683 and Hospital Epidemiology 39, 323–328.
684 Bryden, W., 2007. Mycotoxins in the food chain: Human health implications. Asia Pacific
685 Journal of Clinical Nutrition 16 Suppl 1, 95–101.
686 Bundgaard-Nielsen, K., Nielsen, P.V., 1996. Fungicidal effect of 15 disinfectants against 25
687 fungal contaminants commonly found in bread and cheese manufacturing. Journal of
688 Food Protection 59, 268–275.
689 Buschini, A., 2004. Sodium hypochlorite-, chlorine dioxide- and peracetic acid-induced
690 genotoxicity detected by the Comet assay and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* D7 tests.
691 Mutagenesis 19, 157–162.
692 Carmona-Gutierrez, D., Sommer, C., Andryushkova, A., Kroemer, G., Madeo, F., 2012. A
693 higher spirit: avoiding yeast suicide during alcoholic fermentation. Cell Death and
694 Differentiation 19, 913–914.
695 Coton, M., Dantigny, P., 2019. Mycotoxin migration in foods. Current Opinion in Food
696 Science 29, 88–93.
697 Dagnas, S., Membré, J.-M., 2013. Predicting and preventing mold spoilage of food products.
698 Journal of Food Protection 76, 538–551.
699 Dantigny, P., 2016. Relevant issues in predictive mycology. Current Opinion in Food Science
700 11, 29–33.

701 Dao, T., Bensoussan, M., Gervais, P., Dantigny, P., 2008. Inactivation of conidia of
702 *Penicillium chrysogenum*, *P. digitatum* and *P. italicum* by ethanol solutions and
703 vapours. International journal of food microbiology 122, 68–73.
704 Dao, T., Dantigny, P., 2011. Control of food spoilage fungi by ethanol. Food Control 22, 360–
705 368.
706 Dao, T., Dantigny, P., 2009. Preparation of fungal conidia impacts their susceptibility to
707 inactivation by ethanol vapours. International Journal of Food Microbiology 135, 268–
708 273.
709 Dao, T., Dejardin, J., Bensoussan, M., Dantigny, P., 2010. Use of the Weibull model to
710 describe inactivation of dry-harvested conidia of different *Penicillium* species by
711 ethanol vapours. Journal of Applied Microbiology, 408-414.
712 Denyer, S.P., 1995. Mechanisms of action of antibacterial biocides. International
713 Biodeterioration and Biodegradation 36, 227–245.
714 Denyer, S.P., Stewart, G.S.A.B., 1998. Mechanisms of action of disinfectants. International
715 Biodeterioration and Biodegradation 41, 261–268.
716 Dijksterhuis, J., Meijer, M., van Doorn, T., Samson, R., Rico-Munoz, E., 2018. Inactivation
717 of stress-resistant ascospores of *Eurotiales* by industrial sanitizers. International Journal
718 of Food Microbiology 285, 27–33.
719 Dukan, S., Belkin, S., Touati, D., 1999. Reactive oxygen species are partially involved in the
720 bacteriocidal action of hypochlorous acid. Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics
721 367, 311–316.
722 Ebling, P.M., 2007. Effectiveness of sodium hypochlorite against spores of *Penicillium*
723 *brevicompactum* in an insect rearing facility. Information Report GLC-X-8, 5pp.

724 European Commission, 2005. Regulation (EC) N° 396/2005 on maximum residue levels of
725 pesticides in or on food and feed of plant and animal origin and amending Council
726 Directive 91/414/EEC.
727 European Standard n. 1275, 2006. Chemical disinfectants and antiseptics - Quantitative
728 suspension test for the evaluation of basic fungicidal or basic yeasticidal activity of
729 chemical disinfectants and antiseptics - Test method and requirements (phase 1).
730 European Standard n. 1650, 2019. Chemical disinfectants and antiseptics - Quantitative
731 suspension test for the evaluation of fungicidal or yeasticidal activity of chemical
732 disinfectants and antiseptics used in food, industrial, domestic and institutional areas -
733 Test method and requirements (phase 2, step 1).
734 European Standard n. 13624, 2019. Chemical disinfectants and antiseptics - Quantitative
735 suspension test for the evaluation of fungicidal or yeasticidal activity in the medical area
736 - Test method and requirements (phase 2, step 1)
737 European Standard n. 13697+A1, 2019. Chemical disinfectants and antiseptics - Quantitative
738 non- porous surface test for the evaluation of bactericidal and/or fungicidal activity of
739 chemical disinfectants used in food, industrial, domestic and institutional areas - Test
740 method and requirements without mechanical action (phase 2, step 2).
741 European Standard n. 17272, 2020. Chemical disinfectants and antiseptics - Methods of
742 airborne room disinfection by automated process - Determination of bactericidal,
743 mycobactericidal, sporicidal, fungicidal, yeasticidal, virucidal and phagocidal activities.
744 European Union, 2015. Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 concerning the making available on the
745 market and use of biocidal products.
746 European Union, 2017. Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 concerning the making available on the
747 market and use of biocidal products. Active chlorine released from sodium hypochlorite
748 Product-type 1 (Human hygiene).

749 Frison, L., Sobrero, S., Fernandez, V., Basílico, M.L.Z., 2015. Susceptibility of black
750 *Aspergilli* conidia to industrial sanitizers. International Research Journal of Public and
751 Environmental Health 2, 65-69.

752 Fukuzaki, S., 2006. Mechanisms of actions of sodium hypochlorite in cleaning and
753 disinfection Processes. Biocontrol Science 11, 147–157.

754 Gaulin, C., Lê, M-L., Shum, M., Fong, D. 2011. Disinfectants and sanitizers for use on food
755 contact surfaces. National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health, Toronto,
756 Canada, 15p.

757 Gómez-López, V.M., Rajkovic, A., Ragaert, P., Smigic, N., Devlieghere, F., 2009. Chlorine
758 dioxide for minimally processed produce preservation: a review. Trends in Food
759 Science and Technology 20, 17–26.

760 Gonçalves Lemos, J., Stefanello, A., Olivier Bernardi, A., Valle Garcia, M., Nicoloso
761 Magrini, L., Cichoski, A.J., Wagner, R., Copetti, M.V. 2020. Antifungal efficacy of
762 sanitizers and electrolyzed waters against toxigenic *Aspergillus*. Food Research
763 International 137, 109451.

764 Gupta, A.K., Ahmad, I., Summerbell, R.C., 2002. Fungicidal activities of commonly used
765 disinfectants and antifungal pharmaceutical spray preparations against clinical strains of
766 *Aspergillus* and *Candida* species. Medical Mycology 40, 201–208.

767 Henderson, C.M., Block, D.E., 2014. Examining the role of membrane lipid composition in
768 determining the ethanol tolerance of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Applied and
769 Environmental Microbiology 80, 2966–2972.

770 Ibeas, J.I., Jimenez, J., 1997. Mitochondrial DNA loss caused by ethanol in *Saccharomyces*
771 flor yeasts. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 63, 7–12.

772 Ingram, L.O., Buttke, T.M., 1985. Effects of alcohols on micro-organisms. Advances in
773 Microbial Physiology 25, 253–300.

774 Jeffrey, D.J., 1995. Chemicals used as disinfectants: active ingredients and enhancing
775 additives. Revue scientifique et technique 14, 57–74.
776 Jennings, M.C., Minbiole, K.P.C., Wuest, W.M., 2015. Quaternary ammonium compounds:
777 An antimicrobial mainstay and platform for innovation to address bacterial resistance.
778 ACS Infectious Diseases 1, 288–303.
779 Jones, R.P., Greenfield, P.F., 1987. Ethanol and the fluidity of the yeast plasma membrane.
780 Yeast 3, 223–232.
781 Karabulut, O.A., Gabler, F.A., Mansour, M., Smilanick, J.L., 2004. Postharvest ethanol and
782 water treatments of table grapes to control gray mold. Postharvest Biology and
783 Technology 34, 169-177.
784 Karabulut, O.A., Romanazzi, G., Smilanick, J.L., Lichter, A., 2005. Postharvest ethanol and
785 potassium sorbate treatments of table grapes to control gray mold. Postharvest Biology
786 and Technology 37, 129-134.
787 Korukluoglu, M., Sahan, Y., Yigit, A., 2006. The fungicidal efficacy of various commercial
788 disinfectants used in the food industry. Annals of Microbiology 56, 325–330.
789 Kotula, K.L., Kotula, A.W., Rose, B.E., Pierson, C.J., Camp, M., 1997. Reduction of aqueous
790 chlorine by organic material. Journal of Food Protection 60, 276–282.
791 Lee, W.-N., Huang, C.-H., 2019. Formation of disinfection byproducts in wash water and
792 lettuce by washing with sodium hypochlorite and peracetic acid sanitizers. Food
793 Chemistry: X 1, 100003.
794 Leidholdt, R., 2000. Chlorine-“special agent” for disinfecting water. Opflow 26, 40–43.
795 Ma, X., Bibby, K., 2017. Free chlorine and monochloramine inactivation kinetics of
796 *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* in drinking water. Water Research 120, 265–271.

797 Martin, H., Maris, P., 2012. Synergism between hydrogen peroxide and seventeen acids
798 against five agri-food-borne fungi and one yeast strain. Journal of Applied
799 Microbiology 113, 1451–1460.
800 Martyny, J.W., Harbeck, R.J., Pacheco, K., Barker, E.A., Sills, M., Silveira, L., Arbuckle, S.,
801 Newman, L., 2005. Aerosolized sodium hypochlorite inhibits viability and allergenicity
802 of mold on building materials. Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology 116, 630–
803 635.
804 Mattei, A.S., Madrid, I.M., Santin, R., Schuch, L.F.D., Meireles, M.C.A., 2013. *In vitro*
805 activity of disinfectants against *Aspergillus* spp. Brazilian Journal of Microbiology 44,
806 481–484.
807 McDonnell, G., Russell, A.D., 1999. Antiseptics and disinfectants: activity, action, and
808 resistance. Clinical Microbiology Reviews 12, 147–179.
809 Mlikota Gabler, F., Mansour, M.F., Smilanick, J.L., Mackey, B.E., 2004. Survival of spores
810 of *Rhizopus stolonifer*, *Aspergillus niger*, *Botrytis cinerea* and *Alternaria alternata* after
811 exposure to ethanol solutions at various temperatures. Journal of Applied Microbiology
812 96, 1354-1360.
813 Morin-Sardin, S., Nodet, P., Coton, E., Jany, J-L., 2017. *Mucor*: A Janus-faced fungal genus
814 with human health impact and industrial applications. Fungal Biology Reviews 31, 12-
815 32.
816 Morrison, V.A., Haake, R.J., Weisdorf, D.J. 1994. Non-Candida fungal infections after bone
817 marrow transplantation: risk factors and outcome. American Journal of Medicine 96,
818 497-503.
819 Mupparapu, M., Kothari, K.R.M., 2019. Review of surface disinfection protocols in dentistry:
820 a 2019 update. Quintessence International 50, 58–65.

821 Nierop Groot, M., Abee, T., van Bokhorst-van de Veen, H., 2019. Inactivation of conidia
822 from three *Penicillium* spp. isolated from fruit juices by conventional and alternative
823 mild preservation technologies and disinfection treatments. Food Microbiology 81,
824 108–114.
825 Okull, D.O., Demirci, A., Rosenberger, D., Laborde, L.F., 2006. Susceptibility of *Penicillium*
826 *expansum* spores to sodium hypochlorite, electrolyzed oxidizing water, and chlorine
827 dioxide solutions modified with nonionic surfactants. Journal of Food Protection 69,
828 1944–1948.
829 Pereira, V.J., Marques, R., Marques, M., Benoliel, M.J., Barreto Crespo, M.T., 2013. Free
830 chlorine inactivation of fungi in drinking water sources. Water Research 47, 517–523.
831 Price, P.B., 1939. Ethyl alcohol as a germicide. Archives of Surgery 38, 528.
832 Qin, G., Liu, J., Cao, B., Li, B., Tian, S., 2011. Hydrogen peroxide acts on sensitive
833 mitochondrial proteins to induce death of a fungal pathogen revealed by proteomic
834 analysis. PLoS One 6, e21945.
835 Rasin, G. 2021. Food Grade Sanitizer: What are Approved Sanitizers for Food Service?
836 https://www.ebpsupply.com/blog/food-grade-sanitizers. Accessed 08/22/2021.
837 Reynolds, K.A., Boone, S., Bright, K.R., Gerba, C.P., 2012. Occurrence of household mold
838 and efficacy of sodium hypochlorite disinfectant. Journal of Occupational and
839 Environmental Hygiene 9, 663–669.
840 Roberts, R.G., Reymond, S.T., 1994. Chlorine dioxide for reduction of postharvest pathogen
841 inoculum during handling of tree fruits. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 60,
842 2864–2868.
843 Rossman, L.A., Clark, R.M., Grayman, W.M., 1994. Modeling chlorine residuals in
844 drinking-water distribution systems. Journal of Environmental Engineering 120, 803–
845 820.

Russell, A.D., 2003. Similarities and differences in the responses of microorganisms to biocides. Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy 52, 750–763.

Salamão, B.C.M., Churey, J.J., Aragão, G.M.F., Worobio, R.W., 2009. Modeling *Penicillium expansum* resistance to thermal and chlorine treatments. Journal of Food Protection 72, 2618-2622.

Sandle, T., 2017. The European approach to disinfectant qualification. La Vague 45–48.

Scaramuzza, N., Mutti, P., Cigarini, M., Berni, E., 2020. Effect of peracetic acid on ascospore-forming molds and test microorganisms used for bio-validations of sanitizing processes in food plants. International Journal of Food Microbiology 332, 108772.

Seeliger, H.P., Schröter, G. 1984. Prevention of fungal infections in hospitalized patients. Immunitat und Infektion 12, 143-150.

Sengun, I., Yaman, D., Gonul, S., 2008. Mycotoxins and mould contamination in cheese: a review. World Mycotoxin Journal 1, 291–298.

Simon, S.A., McIntosh, T.J., 1984. Interdigitated hydrocarbon chain packing causes the biphasic transition behavior in lipid/alcohol suspensions. Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Biomembranes 773, 169–172.

Stanga, M., 2010. Disinfectants and sanitation technology. In: M. Stanga (Ed.). Sanitation. Wiley-VCH, Weinham, Germany. pp. 499–554.

Stefanello, A., Nicoloso Magrini, L., Gonçalves Lemos, J., Valle Garcia, M., Bernardi, A.O, Cichoski, A. J., Copetti. M.V., 2020. Comparison of electrolized water and multiple chemical sanitizer action against heat-resistant molds (HRM). International Journal of Food Microbiology 335, 108856.

Stefanello, A., Copetti Fracari, J., Silva, M., Gonçalves Lemos, J., Valle Garcia, M., Alves dos Santos, B., Copetti, M.V., 2021. Influence of type, concentration, exposure time, temperature, and presence of organic load on the antifungal efficacy of industrial

sanitizers against *Aspergillus brasiliensis* (ATCC 16404). Food Microbiology 97, 103740.

Tesnière, C., 2019. Importance and role of lipids in wine yeast fermentation. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology 103, 8293–8300.

van Klingeren, B., Koller, W., Bloomfield, S.F., Böhm, R., Cremieux, A., Holah, J., Reybrouck, G., Rödger, H.-J., 1998. Assessment of the efficacy of disinfectants on surfaces. International Biodeterioration and Biodegradation 41, 289–296.

Visconti, V., Rigalma, K., Coton, E., Dantigny, P., 2020. Impact of intraspecific variability and physiological state on *Penicillium commune* inactivation by 70% ethanol. International Journal of Food Microbiology 332, 108782.

Weber, F.J., de Bont, J.A.M., 1996. Adaptation mechanisms of microorganisms to the toxic effects of organic solvents on membranes. Biochimica and Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Reviews on Biomembranes 1286, 225–245.

Wen, G., Xu, X., Huang, T., Zhu, H., Ma, J., 2017. Inactivation of three genera of dominant fungal spores in groundwater using chlorine dioxide: Effectiveness, influencing factors, and mechanisms. Water Research 125, 132–140.

Wildfeuer, A., Seidl, H.P., Paule, I., Haberreiter, A. 1998. In vitro evaluation of voriconazole against clinical isolates of yeasts, moulds and dermatophytes in comparison with itraconazole, ketoconazole, amphotericin B and griseofulvin. Mycoses 41, 309-319.

You, K.M., Rosenfield, C.-L., Knipple, D.C., 2003. Ethanol tolerance in the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* is dependent on cellular oleic acid content. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 69, 1499–1503.

Table 1: European standards for fungicidal assessment of disinfectants

European Standard	Year	Areas	Method	Interfering substances	Experimental conditions	Required log reduction
EN 1275	2006	Not stated	Suspension test	none	20°C/15 min	≥ 4
EN 1650	2019	Food, industrial, domestic and institutional	Suspension test	Bovin serum albumin / skimmed milk	4-40°C/1-60 min	≥ 4
EN 13624	2019	Medical	Suspension test	Bovin serum albumin / sheep erythrocytes	4-30°C/5-60 min	≥ 4
EN 13697/+A1	2019	Food, industrial, domestic and institutional	Carrier test	Bovin serum albumin / skimmed milk	4-40°C/1-60 min	≥ 3
EN 17272	2020	Medical, veterinary, food, industrial, domestic and institutional	Airborne room disinfection by automated process	Bovin serum albumin / skimmed milk / erythrocytes/ yeast extract	20°C/≤ 15h /50-75% RH	≥ 4

Table 2: Concentrations of some sanitizers approved in the Canada and the US for use on food contact surfaces.

Compounds	Utilisation range	Recommended concentrations	Reference	Country
Hypochlorites	50-500 ppm	200 ppm (non porous) 800 ppm (porous)	Gaulin *et al.* 2011	Canada
		200 ppm	Rasin, 2021	US
Chlorine dioxide		100 ppm	Rasin, 2021	US
Iodophors	6.5-75 ppm		Gaulin *et al.* 2011	Canada
		25 ppm	Rasin, 2021	US
Peracetic acid	50-350 ppm	150-200 ppm	Gaulin *et al.* 2011	Canada
		100-200 ppm	Rasin, 2021	US
Hydrogen peroxide	Powder in 3 and 6%		Gaulin *et al.* 2011	Canada
		80-600 ppm	Rasin, 2021	US
Quaternary ammonium	200-1000 ppm	200 ppm	Gaulin *et al.* 2011	Canada
	100-400 ppm	200 ppm	Rasin, 2021	US

Table 3: Fungicidal effect of disinfectants on different mold species, concentration used and application conditions.

Organism	Disinfectant	Concentration	Application conditions	Fungicidal effect	Reference
Absidia corymbifera	Hydrogen peroxide	Up to 50% (m/v)	Liquid / 15 min 20°C	3 log (12.5%)	Martin and Maris, 2012
Alternaria alternata	Sodium hypochlorite	2.4%	Spray on surface / 5-10 min	3.5-3.6 log (5 min)	Reynolds *et al.*, 2012
Aspergillus australensis	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-2%	Surface / 15 min	2.0-4.9 log	Stefanello *et al*., 2020
	Biguanide	2-5%	Surface / 15 min	1.0-2.9 log	
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Surface / 15 min	1->5 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.3-1%	Surface / 15 min	3-3.9 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.5-1%	Surface / 15 min	2-3.9 log	
	Ortho-phenylphenol	15% 1g/m^3	Fumigation / 7h	2-2.9 log	
Aspergillus aureoluteus	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-2%	Surface / 15 min	2-2.9 log	Stefanello *et al*., 2020
	Biguanide	2-5%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Surface / 15 min	2-4.9 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.3-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.5-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	
	Ortho-phenylphenol	15% 1g/m^3	Fumigation / 7h	3-3.9 log	
Aspergillus brasiliensis	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-5% 0.3-2%	Liquid / 15 min Liquid / 5 – 15 min	1-3.9 log 1.58-4.67 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2018 Stefanello *et al.* 2021
	Biguanide hexamethylene	2-5%	Liquid / 15 min	<1 log	Bernardi *et al.,* 2018
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3% 0.3-1%	Liquid 15 min Liquid 5 – 15 min	1-3.9 log 0.94-5.67 log	Bernardi *et al.,* 2018 Stefanello *et al.* 2021
	Quaternary ammonium	0.3-5%	Liquid 15 min	<1-2.9 log	Bernardi *et al.* 2018
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.1-1% 0.5-1%	Liquid 15 min Liquid 5 -15 min	3->4 log 1.10-2.67 log	Bernardi *et al.* 2018 Stefanello *et al.* 2021
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Liquid 5 – 15 min	1.17-3.50 log	Stefanello *et al.* 2021
	Peracetic acid	0.1%	Surface / 40°C	4 log (20-60 s)	Scaramuzza *et al.* 2020

Aspergillus carbonarius	Peracetic acid	0.3-1%	Surface / 15 min	2->5 log	Gonçalves Lemos *et al*., 2020
	Biguanide	2-5%	Surface / 15 min	1-2.9 log	
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-2%	Surface / 15 min	2-3.9 log	
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Surface / 15 min	1- 4.9 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.5-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	
Aspergillus fischeri	Chlorine dioxide	50-1000 ppm	Liquid / 5-60 min	>5 log (500 ppm/5 min)	Dijksterhuis *et al.*, 2018
Aspergillus flavus	Sodium hypochlorite	0.2-0.8%	Surface / 2-8 min	<4.2 log (0.2-0.8%/2 min and 0.4%/ 2-8 min)	Andrews, 1996
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.0125-0.4%	Liquid / 72h	>2.7 log (0.0125-0.2%)	Mattei *et al.*, 2013
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.1-1.6%		>2.7 log (0.4-1.6%)	
	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2->5.2 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>5.2 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.L^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4.3 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4.3 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.3-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-2.9 log	Gonçalves Lemos *et al*., 2020
	Biguanide	2-5%	Surface / 15 min	<1-1.9 log	
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-2%	Surface / 15 min	2-4.9 log	
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Surface / 15 min	1->5 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.5-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	
Aspergillus fumigatus	Benzalconium chloride	0.0125-0.4%	Liquid / 72h	>2.7 log (0.0125-0.05%)	Mattei *et al.,* 2013

	Chlorophenol derivative	0.0175-0.6%		>2.7 log (0.075-0.3%)	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.1-1.6%		>2.7 log (0.4-0.8%)	
	Free chlorine	48.99-194.7 mg.min.L^{-1}	Liquid pH 7; 22.5°C	4 log (60.43-77.33 mg.min.l^{-1})	Ma and Bibby, 2017
	Monochloramine	90.33-531.3 mg.min.L^{-1}	Liquid pH 8; 22.5°C	4 log (120-136.7 mg.min.l^{-1})	
	Sodium hypochlorite	1-3 mg.L^{-1} free chlorine	Liquid pH 7; 25°C	2 log (946 mg.min.l^{-1})	Pereira *et al.*, 2013
Aspergillus hiratsukae	Peracetic acid	0.1%	Surface / 40°C	4 log (175-300 s)	Scaramuzza *et al.* 2020
Aspergillus niger	Benzalconium chloride	0.0125-0.4%		>2.7 log (0.025%)	Mattei *et al.,*2013
	Chlorophenol derivative	0.0175-0.6%		>2.7 log (0.15-0.30%)	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.1-1.6%		>2.7 log (0.4%)	
	Sodium hypochlorite	100-1300 mg.l^{-1}	Liquid / 1-30 min pH 6.3 ; 9, 20°C	4 log (700-1300 mg.l^{-1}/1.1-28.8 min)	Frison *et al.*, 2015a
	Peracetic acid	750-6000 mg.l^{-1}			
	Sodium hypochlorite	2.4%	Spray on surface / 5-10 min	4.1-5.3 log (5 min)	Reynolds *et al.*, 2012
	Isopropyl alcohol	Un-diluted	Liquid / 1-60 min	6 log (10-25 min)	Korukluoglu *et al.*, 2006
	Peracetic acid	0.1, 0.3%	Liquid / 1-60 min	6 log (0.3% / ≥ 55 min)	
	Iodine	0.5, 1%	Liquid / 1-60 min	6 log (1% / 12-49 min)	
	Formaldehyde	0.2 ; 0.5%	Liquid / 1-60 min	6 log (2-15 min)	
	Quaternary ammonium compounds	0.5-2%	Liquid / 1-60 min	6 log (1% / <2->51 min)	
	Chlorine	0.5-2%	Liquid / 1-60 min	6 log (0.5% / <1-3 min)	
	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.7->5.2 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>5.2 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>5.2 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min	>5.2 log	

			20°C		
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>5.2 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>5.2 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.3-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	Gonçalves Lemos *et al*., 2020
	Biguanide	2-5%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-2%	Surface / 15 min	2-3.9 log	
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-3.9 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.5-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-2.9 log	
Aspergillus nomius	Peracetic acid	0.3-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	Gonçalves Lemos *et al*., 2020
	Biguanide	2-5%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-2%	Surface / 15 min	2-3.9 log	
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-4.9 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.5-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-2.9 log	
Aspergillus ochraceus	Chlorine	1%	Liquid / 0.25-24h	>6.5 log	Gupta *et al.*, 2002
	Peracetic acid	0.3-1%	Surface / 15 min	>5 log	Gonçalves Lemos *et al*., 2020
	Biguanide	2-5%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-2%	Surface / 15 min	2-3.9 log	
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Surface / 15 min	2->5 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.5-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-2.9 log	
Aspergillus parasiticus	Sodium hypochlorite	0.2-0.8%	Surface / 2-8 min	<4.1 (0.2-0.8%/2 min and 0.4%/ 2-8 min)	Andrews, 1996
	Peracetic acid	0.3-1%	Surface / 15 min	>1-1.9 log	Gonçalves Lemos *et al*., 2020
	Biguanide	2-5%	Surface / 15 min	>1-1.9 log	

	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-2%	Surface / 15 min	1->5 log	
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Surface / 15 min	<1-3.9 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.5-1%	Surface / 15 min	<1-1.9 log	
Aspergillus pseudoglaucus	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-5%	Liquid / 15 min Surface / 15 min / 20°C	1.10-1.56 log 0.1-1.9 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2019 Bernardi *et al.*, 2021
	Biguanide	2-5% 0.3-5%	Liquid / 15 min Surface / 15 min / 20°C	1.01-2.02 log 1-1.9 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2019 Bernardi *et al.*, 2021
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3%	Liquid / 15 min Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0-3.36 log 1-2.9 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2019 Bernardi *et al.*, 2021
	Quaternary ammonium	0.3-5%	Liquid / 15 min	1.12-1.79 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2019
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.01-0.2% 0.01-1%	Liquid / 15 min Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0-1.50 log 0.9-1.9 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2019 Bernardi *et al.*, 2021
	Ortho-phenylphenol	1g/m^3	Fumigation	0 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2021
Aspergillus terreus	Sodium hypochlorite	1-3 mg.l^{-1} free chlorine	Liquid pH 7; 25°C	2 log (1404 mg.min.l^{-1})	Pereira *et al.*, 2013
Aspergillus versicolor	Free chlorine	48.99-194.7 mg.min.l^{-1}	Liquid pH 7; 22.5°C	4 log (112.1 mg.min.l^{-1})	Ma and Bibby, 2017
	Monochloramine	90.33-531.3 mg.min.l^{-1}	Liquid pH 8; 22.5°C	4 log (707.8 mg.min.l^{-1})	
	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	1.2-4 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2-3 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.3->5.2 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.3->5.2 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 g.l^{-1}	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.5 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3-3.3 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min	>4.5 log	

			20°C		
	Hydrogen peroxide	Up to 50% (m/v)	Liquid / 15 min 20°C	3 log (1.56%)	Martin and Maris, 2012
Aspergillus westerdijkiae	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-5%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0.1-1.9 log	Bernardi et al., 2021
	Biguanide	0.3-5%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0.1-0.9 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0.1-2.9 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.01-1%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0->5 log	
	Ortho-phenylphenol	1g/m^3	Fumigation	2-3.9 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.3-1%	Surface / 15 min	1->5 log	Gonçalves Lemos *et al*., 2020
	Biguanide	2-5%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-2%	Surface / 15 min	2-4.9 log	
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Surface / 15 min	1->5 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.5-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-3.9 log	
Chaetomium globosum	Peracetic acid	0.1%	Surface / 40°C	4 log (1-3h)	Scaramuzza *et al.* 2020
Cladosporium cladosporioides	Benzalkonium chloride	2-5%	Liquid / 15 min	2->4 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2018
	Biguanide hexamethylene	2-5%		<1 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3%		1->4 log	
	Quaternary ammonium	0.3-5%		1->4 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.1-1%		>4 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	1-3 $mg.L^{-1}$ free chlorine	Liquid pH 7; 25°C	2 log (139 $mg.min.l^{-1}$)	Pereira *et al.*, 2013
Cladosporium herbarum	Sodium hypochlorite	2.4%	Spray on surface / 5-10 min	4.1 log (5 min)	Reynolds *et al.*, 2012
Cladosporium tenuissimum	Sodium hypochlorite	1-3 $mg.l^{-1}$ free chlorine	Liquid pH 7; 25°C	2 log (71 $mg.min.l^{-1}$)	Pereira *et al.*, 2013
Cladosporium sp.	Chlorine dioxide	0.5-3 $mg.l^{-1}$	Liquid	1 log (1 $mg.min.l^{-1}$)	Wen *et al.*, 2017

			pH 6, 7/10, 27°C		
	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.9->4.1 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.1 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.1 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.1 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.9 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.1 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.1 log	
Dothiorella gregaria	Chlorine dioxide	3-7 $mg.l^{-1}$	Surface / 1-15 min	1.5-5 log (15 min)	Chen and Zhu, 2011
Eurotium repens (=*A. pseudoglaucus*)	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.3->4.5 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.3 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.3 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	0.3 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.5 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.5 log	
Fusarium tricinctum	Chlorine dioxide	3-7 $mg.l^{-1}$	Surface / 1-15 min	1.4-4.5 log (15 min)	Chen and Zhu, 2011

Geotrichum candidum	Hydrogen peroxide	Up to 50% (m/v)	Liquid / 15 min 20°C	3 log (0.39%)	Martin and Maris, 2012
Hyphopichia burtonii	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-5%	Liquid / 15 min	0-3.19 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2019
	Biguanide	2-5%	Liquid / 15 min	0.84-0.98 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3%	Liquid / 15 min	0-5.67 log	
	Quaternary ammonium	0.3-5%	Liquid / 15 min	0-2.35 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.01-0.2%	Liquid / 15 min	0-1.89 log	
Monascus ruber	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.9->4.1 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.1 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	1.3 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	0.9 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	1.6 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.1 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.9 log	
Mucor bainieri	Sodium hypochlorite	2.4%	Spray on surface / 5-10 min	5.2-5.3 log (5 min)	Reynolds *et al.*, 2012
Neosartorya pseudofischeri	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.3->4.5 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.3 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.3 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.6 log	

	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.3 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4 log	
Paecilomyces fulvus	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-2%	Surface / 15 min	2-3.9 log	Stefanello *et al.*, 2020
	Biguanide	2-5%	Surface / 15 min	2-2.9 log	
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Surface / 15 min	2-4.9 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.3-1%	Surface / 15 min	3->5 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.5-1%	Surface / 15 min	2-3.9 log	
	Ortho-phenylphenol	15% 1g/m^3	Fumigation / 7h	>5 log	
Paecilomyces niveus	Chlorine dioxide	50-1000 ppm	Liquid / 5-60 min	>5 log (500 ppm/5 min)	Dijksterhuis *et al.*, 2018
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-2%	Surface / 15 min	2->5 log	Stefanello *et al.*, 2020
	Biguanide	2-5%	Surface / 15 min	2-3.9 log	
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Surface / 15 min	3-4.9 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.3-1%	Surface / 15 min	3->5 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.5-1%	Surface / 15 min	2-3.9 log	
	Ortho-phenylphenol	15% 1g/m^3	Fumigation / 7h	>5 log	
Paecilomyces variotii	Chlorine dioxide	50-1000 ppm	Liquid / 5-60 min	>5 log (500 ppm/5 min)	Dijksterhuis *et al.*, 2018
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-2%	Surface / 15 min	1-3.9 log	Stefanello *et al.*, 2020
	Biguanide	2-5%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	
	Iodine	0.2-1%	Surface / 15 min	1->5 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.3-1%	Surface / 15 min	1->5 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.5-1%	Surface / 15 min	1-1.9 log	
	Ortho-phenylphenol	15% 1g/m^3	Fumigation / 7h	>5 log	
Penicillium bialowiezense	Sodium hypochlorite	500 ppm free chlorine	Surface 7°C	2.6 log (5 min)	Nierop Groot *et al.*, 2019
	Chlorine dioxide	500 ppm free chlorine	Surface 7°C	>5 log (5 min)	
Penicillium buchwaldii	Sodium hypochlorite	500 ppm free chlorine	Surface 7°C	0.9 log (5 min)	Nierop Groot *et al.*, 2019
	Chlorine dioxide	500 ppm free	Surface	>5 log (5 min)	

		chlorine	7°C		
Penicillium brevicompactum	Sodium hypochlorite	1-10%	Surface / 1-30 min	>7.3 log (30 min)	Ebling, 2007
Penicillium caseifulvum	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.7->4.9 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.7 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.7 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.7 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	1.9 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.7 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.9 log	
Penicillium chrysogenum	Ethanol	5-10%	Liquid / 1-4 days 10-30°C 0.7-0.9 a_w	0.36-5.78 log	Dao *et al.*, 2008
	Ethanol	5-10%	Vapour / 1-4 days 10-30°C 0.7-0.9 a_w	0.13-2.47 log	
	Ethanol	0.67 kPa	Vapour/ 48-120 h	4-6.5 log	Dao and Dantigny, 2009
	Ethanol	0.7-7.5 kPa	Vapours / 24 h 25°C	3.1->5 log	Dao *et al.*, 2010
	Sodium hypochlorite	2.4%	Spray on surface / 5-10 min	4.6-5.4 log (5 min)	Reynolds *et al.*, 2012
	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4->5.2 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium	2%	Liquid / 10 min	4 log	

	+ aldehydes		20°C		
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>5.2 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>5.2 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.7 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>5.2 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>5.2 log	
Penicillium citrinum	Sodium hypochlorite	1-3 $mg.l^{-1}$ free chlorine	Liquid pH 7; 25°C	2 log (959 $mg.min.l^{-1}$)	Pereira *et al.*, 2013
Penicillium cyclopium	Hydrogen peroxide	Up to 50% (m/v)	Liquid / 15 min 20°C	3 log (1.56%)	Martin and Maris, 2012
Penicillium commune	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-5%	Liquid / 15 min	1-2.9 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2018
	Biguanide hexamethylene	2-5%		1-1.9 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3%		2->4 log	
	Quaternary ammonium	0.3-5%		2->4 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.1-1%		2->4 log	
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-5%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0.1-4 log	Bernardi *et al.,* 2021
	Biguanide	0.3-5%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0-2 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0.1->5 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.01-1%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0.1->5 log	
	Ortho-phenylphenol	$1g/m^3$	Fumigation	0-0.9 log	
	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.7-4.3 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.7-4.3 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min	2.9-4 log	

			20°C		
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.7-4 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	1.7-4 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4.3->5.2 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	1.7-4 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 1-5 min	2.35-5.4 log	Visconti *et al.*, 2020
Penicillium coryphilum	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.7->4.8 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.8 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4.6 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.8 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4.4 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.8 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.8 log	
Penicillium crustosum	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4->5.2 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.2 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4 log	

	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.3 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	4 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>5.2 log	
Penicillium digitatum	Ethanol	5-10%	Liquid / 1-4 days 10-30°C 0.7-0.9 a_w	0.76-3.19 log	Dao *et al.*, 2008
	Ethanol	5-10%	Vapour / 1-4 days 10-30°C 0.7-0.9 a_w	2.15-3.95 log	
	Ethanol	0.67 kPa	Vapour/ 48-120 h	4-5 log	Dao and Dantigny, 2009
	Ethanol	0.7-7.5 kPa	Vapours / 24 h 25°C	4.2->5 log	Dao *et al.*, 2010
Penicillium discolor	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	1.9 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.2 log	
Penicillium	Sodium hypochlorite	50 ppm free	Liquid / 0.5-5 min	0.2-1.9 log	Okull *et al.*, 2006

expansum		chlorine	pH 6.3, 8.5		
	Chlorine dioxyde	3 ppm free chlorine	Liquid / 0.5-5 min pH 3.7	1.4-4 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	500 ppm free chlorine	Surface 7°C	0.7 log (5 min)	Nierop Groot *et al.*, 2019
	Chlorine dioxide	500 ppm free chlorine	Surface 7°C	>5 log (5 min)	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanurate-based sanitizer	25-75 ppm free chlorine	Liquid / 1-6 min	3.5-6 log (2 min)	Salamão *et al.*, 2009
Penicillium griseofulvum	Sodium hypochlorite	1-3 $mg.l^{-1}$ free chlorine	Liquid pH 7; 25°C	2 log (107 $mg.min.l^{-1}$)	Pereira *et al.*, 2013
Penicillium italicum	Ethanol	5-10%	Liquid / 1-4 days 10-30°C 0.7-0.9 a_w	0.44-3.65 log	Dao *et al.*, 2008
	Ethanol	5-10%	Vapour / 1-4 days 10-30°C 0.7-0.9 a_w	1.66-4.38 log	
	Ethanol	0.67 kPa	Vapour/ 48-120 h	4-5 log	Dao and Dantigny, 2009
	Ethanol	0.7-7.5 kPa	Vapours / 24 h 25°C	4.1->5 log	Dao *et al.*, 2010
Penicillium nalgiovense	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2->4.2 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.3->4.2 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.3-3 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.3-3 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	1.7->4.2 log	

	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.3->4.2 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.2 log	
Penicillium paneum	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-5%	Liquid / 15 min	1.39-3.96 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2019
	Biguanide	2-5%	Liquid / 15 min	0 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3%	Liquid / 15 min	0-5.75 log	
	Quaternary ammonium	0.3-5%	Liquid / 15 min	0.96-3.19 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.01-0.2%	Liquid / 15 min	0-2.30 log	
Penicillium polonicum	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-5%	Liquid / 15 min	1-3.9 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2018
	Biguanide hexamethylene	2-5%		1-1.9 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3%		1->4 log	
	Quaternary ammonium	0.3-5%		1->4 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.1-1.5%		2->4 log	
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-5%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0.1-1.9 log	Bernardi *et al.,* 2021
	Biguanide	0.3-5%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0-0.9 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0-1.9 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.01-1%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0-3.9 log	
	Ortho-phenylphenol	1g/m^3	Fumigation	0.1-0.9 log	
Penicillium purpurogenum	Free chlorine	48.99-194.7 mg.min.l^{-1}	Liquid pH 7; 22.5°C	4 log (258.9 mg.min.l^{-1})	Ma and Bibby, 2017
	Monochloramine	90.33-531.3 mg.min.l^{-1}	Liquid pH 8, 22.5°C	4 log (200.6 mg.min.l^{-1})	
Penicillium roqueforti	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-5%	Liquid / 15 min	1-3.9 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2018
	Biguanide hexamethylene	2-5%		1-1.9 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3%		1->4 log	

	Quaternary ammonium	0.3-5%		2-2.9 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.1-1%		2->4 log	
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-5%	Liquid / 15 min	0.96-4.19 log	Bernardi *et al.*, 2019
	Biguanide	2-5%	Liquid / 15 min	0.91-1.04 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3%	Liquid / 15 min	2.90-5.66 log	
	Quaternary ammonium	0.3-5%	Liquid / 15 min	1.22-3.83 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.01-0.2%	Liquid / 15 min	0.06-2.28 log	
	Benzalkonium chloride	0.3-5%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0.1-1.9 log	Bernardi *et al.,* 2021
	Biguanide	0.3-5%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0.1-2.9 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.15-3%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0.1->5 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	0.01-1%	Surface / 15 min / 20°C	0.1->5 log	
	Ortho-phenylphenol	$1g/m^3$	Fumigation	0.1-0.9 log	
	Isopropyl alcohol	Un-diluted	Liquid / 1-60 min	6 log (<2-8 min)	Korukluoglu *et al.*, 2006
	Peracetic acid	0.1, 0.3%	Liquid / 1-60 min	6 log (0.3% / ≥ 55 min)	
	Iodine	0.5, 1%	Liquid / 1-60 min	6 log (1% / 5-16 min)	
	Formaldehyde	0.2 ; 0.5%	Liquid / 1-60 min	6 log (1-25 min)	
	Quaternary ammonium compounds	0.5-2%	Liquid / 1-60 min	6 log (1% / <1-21 min)	
	Chlorine	0.5-2%	Liquid / 1-60 min	6 log (0.5% / <1- min)	
	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	1-4 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	1.7-4 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.4-3.6 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.5->5.2 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	$0.37\ g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	0.9-2.7 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min	3.5-4 log	

			20°C		
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>5.2 log	
	Peracetic acid	0.3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	0.3 log	
	Hydrogen peroxide	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	0.3 log	
Penicillium solitum	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.7->4.8 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.7 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.2 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.7 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.7 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.7 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.8 log	
Penicillium verrucosum	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.1->4.2 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.1 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.1 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3.1 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	2.4 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min	3.1 log	

			20°C		
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.2 log	
Penicillium sp	Chlorine dioxide	0.5-3 $mg.l^{-1}$	Liquid pH 6, 7/10, 27°C	5 log (1 $mg.min.l^{-1}$)	Wen *et al.*, 2017
Phoma glomerata	Sodium hypochlorite	1-3 $mg.l^{-1}$ free chlorine	Liquid pH 7; 25°C	2 log (152 $mg.min.l^{-1}$)	Pereira et *al.*, 2013
Scopulariopsis brevicaulis	Quaternary ammonium	1.5, 2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.2 log	Bundgaard and Nielsen, 1995
	Quaternary ammonium + aldehydes	2%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.2 log	
	Ethanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.2 log	
	Isopropanol	70%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.2 log	
	Sodium dichloroisocyanuric acid	0.37 $g.l^{-1}$	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.2 log	
	Chlorine dioxide	5%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	3 log	
	Sodium hypochlorite	3%	Liquid / 10 min 20°C	>4.2 log	
Stachybotrys chartarum	Sodium hypochlorite	2.4%	Spray on surface / 5-10 min	4.1 log (5 min)	Reynolds *et al.*, 2012
Talaromyces bacillisporus	Peracetic acid	0.1%	Surface / 40°C	4 log (400-1200 s)	Scaramuzza *et al.* 2020
Talaromyces macrosporus	Chlorine dioxide	50-1000 ppm	Liquid / 5-60 min	>5 log (500 ppm/30 min)	Dijksterhuis *et al.*, 2018
Trichoderma sp	Chlorine dioxide	0.5-3 $mg.l^{-1}$	Liquid pH 6, 7/10, 27°C	3 log (1 $mg.min.l^{-1}$)	Wen *et al.*, 2017
Trichophyton mentagrophytes	Sodium hypochlorite	2.4%	Spray on surface / 5-10 min	6.6 log (5 min)	Reynolds *et al.*, 2012