

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Effectiveness of a neutral electrolysed oxidising water (NEOW) device in reducing *Legionella pneumophila* in a water distribution system: A comparison between culture, qPCR and PMA-qPCR detection methods

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1672367> since 2018-08-08T11:56:44Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2018.07.053

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

Effectiveness of a neutral electrolysed oxidising water (NEOW) device in reducing *Legionella pneumophila* in a water distribution system: a comparison between culture, qPCR and PMA-qPCR detection methods.

Sara Bonetta^{a1*}, Cristina Pignata^{a1}, Silvia Bonetta^a, Lorenza Meucci^b, Donatella Giacosa^b, Elena Marino^b, Ilaria Gorrasi^a, Giorgio Gilli^a and Elisabetta Carraro^a

^aDepartment of Public Health and Pediatrics, University of Torino, Piazza Polonia 94, 10126 ,Torino, Italy

^bSocietà Metropolitana Acque Torino S.p.A., C.so XI Febbraio 14, 10152, Torino, Italy

***Corresponding author:** Sara Bonetta, Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, University of Torino, Piazza Polonia 94, 10126 , Torino, Italy; tel +39 11 6708192; e-mail: sara.bonetta@unito.it

¹These authors equally contributed to the work

27 **Abstract**

28 Disinfection of hot water systems is critical for reducing Legionnaires' disease in high-risk
29 buildings. The use of neutral electrolysed oxidising water (NEOW) is a promising method for the
30 control of microorganisms in hot water systems. However, full-scale evaluations of the efficacy of
31 NEOW devices to control *Legionella pneumophila* are currently lacking. The aim of this study was
32 to assess the effectiveness of a NEOW device in reducing *L. pneumophila* in a hotel water network.
33 Water samples (n=67) were collected from different sites of a hotel distribution system before and
34 after the installation of the NEOW device at the 1st, 4th, 8th and 12th week. Detection of *L.*
35 *pneumophila* was performed comparing culture, qPCR and PMA-qPCR methods. Total bacterial
36 counts (22°C and 37°C), *Pseudomonas* spp. and physico-chemical parameters were also monitored.
37 The NEOW treatment resulted in a reduction of the amount of *L. pneumophila* positive samples (-
38 32%) and of the number of heavily contaminated points ($> 10^4$ CFU/L and $> 10^3$ CFU/L) (-100%
39 and -96%, respectively). Treatment maintained *L. pneumophila* at low levels ($< 10^2$ CFU/L), which
40 do not require specific intervention measures. The effectiveness of the disinfection system was also
41 confirmed by PMA-qPCR ($p < 0.001$). The use of PMA resulted in a signal decrease in almost all
42 samples upon the disinfection treatment.
43 The NEOW disinfection device appears to be a promising approach to reduce the colonisation of
44 hot water systems by *L. pneumophila*; however, further investigations are needed to ascertain its
45 efficiency over longer time periods.

46
47 **Keywords:** *Legionella pneumophila*, hot water, neutral electrolysed oxidising water, propidium
48 monoazide, qPCR

53 1. Introduction

54

55 *Legionella* spp. are ubiquitous microorganisms that are widely distributed in aquatic environments.
56 From these natural reservoirs, this opportunistic pathogen can spread to and colonise artificial
57 aquatic environments (e.g. building water systems, cooling towers). *Legionella pneumophila* is
58 most frequently associated with human disease (Cunha and Cunha, 2017) and in Europe, 6,573
59 confirmed cases of *L. pneumophila*-associated Legionnaires' Disease were reported in 30 countries
60 in 2015. Four countries (France, Germany, Italy and Spain) accounted for 69% of all notified cases.
61 As in previous years, most cases (69%) were community-acquired, while 21% (1,141 cases) were
62 travel-associated infections (ECDC, 2017).

63 Many studies have demonstrated the widespread presence of *L. pneumophila* in water systems of
64 tourist reception and spa facilities (Coetzee et al., 2012; Mouchtouri et al., 2015). For this reason, it
65 is important to adopt measures to prevent and control the dissemination of *Legionella* through
66 careful risk assessment and management. A range of physical and chemical disinfection methods
67 have been proposed with the aim of controlling *L. pneumophila* contamination; however, to date,
68 the most effective procedures have not been defined (Li et al., 2017; Lin et al., 2011; Marchesi et
69 al., 2016). Therefore, alternative disinfection methods that are effective in controlling the
70 proliferation of *L. pneumophila* could be useful tools to reduce the risk of the spread of
71 Legionnaires' disease.

72 Electrolysed oxidising water (EOW) is a technology (Thorn et al., 2012) based on the
73 electrodialysis of a sodium chloride solution in an electrolysis chamber with an anode (acid EOW)
74 and a cathode (alkaline EOW) separated by a membrane. The mixture of these two solutions forms
75 the neutral EOW (NEOW). NEOW has proved to be effective in the reduction of many waterborne
76 pathogenic microorganisms in laboratory settings (Issa-Zacharia et al., 2010; Park et al., 2004,
77 Cossali et al. 2016) and in the food industry (Rahman et al., 2016). However, full-scale evaluations

78 of the efficacy of NEOW devices to control *Legionella pneumophila* in hot water systems are
79 currently lacking.

80 To date, the most commonly employed method for *L. pneumophila* detection in water samples is
81 the standard culture technique. Despite being essential for identifying and typing *Legionella* strains,
82 the culture method has several limitations, including the inability to detect viable but non-culturable
83 bacteria (VBNC) that may represent a public health hazard, especially when a reclamation treatment
84 is performed (Casini et al., 2014). Quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) may overcome
85 many of the disadvantages of traditional culture methods; however, qPCR does not allow for viable
86 cells to be distinguished from dead cells. A promising approach for detecting viable cells involves
87 the use of qPCR along with photoactivatable DNA intercalators such as propidium or etidium
88 monoazide (PMA or EMA), which can penetrate the membranes of compromised cells and block
89 PCR amplification (Delgado-Viscogliosi et al. 2009; Mansi et al., 2014, Scaturro et al., 2016), with
90 PMA having been shown to be more specific for dead cells compared to EMA (Scaturro et al.,
91 2016). At this time, some studies using the PMA-qPCR method to detect *Legionella* in water
92 samples have already been published (Ditommasso et al., 2016, 2014; Yanez et al., 2011), all of
93 which dealing with water reclaimed with traditional disinfection strategies.

94 The aim of this study was to assess the effectiveness of a NEOW device in reducing both culturable
95 and nonculturable *Legionella pneumophila* in a hotel water network. The standard culture method
96 was used with qPCR alone and in combination with PMA (PMA-qPCR).

97

98 **2. Materials and methods**

99

100 *2.1. Site description*

101

102 The study was conducted in the hot water distribution system of a hotel located in a mountainous
103 area in the province of Turin. The building was constructed in the 1930's and renovated and opened

104 as a hotel in the 1980's. It consists of four floors with 73 rooms and a spa. The water used in the
105 hotel is collected from a private well located near the building and treated with a UV lamp prior to
106 distribution.

107 Since 2014, sampling plans have been implemented to assess *Legionella* spp. contamination in the
108 water distribution system. Some samples collected in the hotel before the NEOW device installation
109 were primarily contaminated by *Legionella pneumophila* serogroups 2-14 at concentrations $>10^4$
110 CFU/L.

111

112 2.2. *Installation of the neutral electrolysed oxidising water (NEOW) device*

113

114 The NEOW device was installed in the hot water distribution system in addition to the UV
115 treatment. Specifically, it was installed after the boiler that heats the water coming into the building
116 (operating temperature of 50°C).

117 NEOW was generated from the electrolysis of a saturated solution of NaCl in a Danolyte Just in
118 time 200 (DJIT) commercial NEOW generator (DueDi s.r.l., Carmagnola, Torino, Italy). NEOW is
119 a product that contains hypochlorous acid, with a neutral pH (~7.0), an active chlorine
120 concentration of 500 mg/L and characterized by an oxidation reduction potential (ORP) of ~850
121 mV. The dosage unit includes a multifunction volumetric pump with a Cl₂ analyser at the boiler
122 inlet. The chlorine concentration at the injection point was set at 0.8 mg/L. The device was also
123 connected to an operations centre to allow for remote control.

124

125 2.3 *Sample collection*

126

127 From September to December of 2015, water samples (n = 67) were collected from the distribution
128 system of the hotel. Detailed information about the sampling sites are reported in Table 1. Samples

129 were collected before (sampling 1) and after the installation of the NEOW device at the 1st, 4th, 8th
130 and 12th week (samplings 2-5).

131 At each sampling point, water samples were collected in three sterile glass bottles (1 litre) (sodium
132 thiosulfate 0.1g/L) and used for culture, qPCR and PMA-qPCR determinations within 24 h. Water
133 was flushed and samples were taken mid-stream.

134

135 2.4 Plate culture method

136

137 Isolation of *Legionella* from water samples was performed by culture method according to the
138 modified ISO 11731-2 (2004). Confirmed colonies were identified (*L. pneumophila* serogroup 1, 2-
139 14 or *Legionella* spp.) using the agglutination test (Legionella latex test; Oxoid). Results were
140 expressed as CFU/L, and the theoretical detection limit of the procedure for 1 L of sample was 1
141 CFU/L.

142

143 2.5 qPCR and PMA-qPCR

144

145 The remaining two litres of samples were concentrated by filtration on two 0.22-µm pore size
146 polycarbonate membranes (Isopore, Millipore). The first filter was directly added to the lysis
147 solution for DNA extraction using a commercially available kit (AquadienTM Kit, BioRad, Milan,
148 Italy) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The second filter was first overlaid with 1 mL of
149 PMA (25 µM) in 60 mm Petri dishes and incubated in the dark for 5 min, followed by a 5 min
150 exposure to a 500 W halogen light source on ice. After irradiation, the filter was added to the lysis
151 solution for DNA extraction using experimental conditions that were optimised in a previous study
152 (Bonetta et al., 2017).

153 Quantitative PCR was performed with a Chromo4TM (BioRad) and a iQ-Check Quanti *L.*
154 *pneumophila* kit (BioRad) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Each sample was assayed

155 in duplicate. Results are expressed as the number of genome units (GUs) per litre. The detection
156 limit of this qPCR method was 5 genome units (GU) per well; the theoretical detection limit of the
157 total method (DNA extraction + qPCR) was 80 GU/L. The quantification limit was 15 GU/5 µL,
158 corresponding to 500 GU/L.

159

160 2.6 Physical, chemical, and microbiological analyses

161

162 Water temperature (Radiometer TIM870, Hach Lange S.r.l., Lainate, Milan, Italy) was determined
163 at the time of sample collection. Conductivity, pH, turbidity, ammonia, and the residual chlorine
164 concentrations in the samples were also analysed (Rice et al., 2012). *Pseudomonas* spp. and total
165 bacterial counts (TBC) at 22°C and 37°C were determined in all samples (ISO 16266:2006; ISO
166 6222:1999).

167

168 2.7 Statistical analysis

169

170 All qPCR data were analysed by the Opticon Monitor Analysis Software version 3.4 (Biorad).
171 Statistical analysis was conducted with the statistical package IBM SPSS Statistics 24.0 (IBM
172 Corporation, Armonk, NY, USA). Significant differences between the concentrations of *Legionella*
173 *pneumophila* (using culture, qPCR and PMA-qPCR) in the five sampling campaigns were assessed
174 by ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparison test. Significance was evaluated within 95%
175 confidence intervals ($p \leq 0.05$). Pearson's test was used to evaluate the correlation between
176 *Legionella pneumophila* and the total bacterial counts.

177

178 3. Results and discussion

179

180 3.1 Quantification of *Legionella pneumophila* using culture and molecular methods

181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206

Figure 1 shows the observed *Legionella pneumophila* contamination at the inlet of the hotel water system and in the water distribution system before (Figure 1a) and after (Figure 1b-e) the NEOW treatment using three different methods. In the examined building, only *L. pneumophila* serogroups 2–14 were isolated.

Before treatment, all water distribution system samples (13/13) were positive according to culture method (Table 2). Five out of the 13 samples exceeded 10^4 CFU/L and four out of the remaining samples exceeded 10^3 CFU/L. The highest *L. pneumophila* concentrations were observed in certain rooms (R1 and R7), in the return loop (RL) and in dressing room (D1 and D2) samples (Figure 1a). Some studies showed that the return loop is one of the most frequently contaminated sites in the water systems of different hotels (Bonetta et al. 2010; Cuhna et al., 2016). The high level observed in some of the rooms and dressing rooms is probably related to the intermittent use of hot water, which can promote water stagnation and *Legionella* proliferation (Bargellini et al., 2011; Cuhna et al., 2016). Also the qPCR method (with or without PMA treatment) showed *L. pneumophila* contamination in almost all the sampling sites of the water distribution system (12/13 and 13/13 respectively). The concentration of *L. pneumophila* (over a range of 3-5 Log GU/L) was generally higher than that estimated as CFU/L reported in other studies (Ditommaso et al., 2014; Yanez et al. 2011). The low differences between qPCR and PMA-qPCR observed in our samples confirmed that only a minimal fraction of non viable cells was present, probably because of a lack of a chemical disinfection system (Scaturro et al., 2016). In contrast, the water sample collected at the inlet of the water system (I) was found contaminated using the culture method, although no contamination was observed by qPCR or PMA-qPCR (Figure 1a). Considering the low contamination of the inlet water entering the structure, these results indicated a phenomenon of bacterial growth within the hotel water distribution system.

During the second sampling campaign, after the application of the NEOW treatment (Table 2), a reduction in the proportion of *L. pneumophila*-positive samples was observed (70%) using the

207 culture method. In particular, the percentage of heavily contaminated points (*L. pneumophila* loads
208 $> 10^4$ CFU/L and $> 10^3$ CFU/L) was reduced to 0% and 10% respectively. In different sampling
209 sites (B, R1, R3 and R6 R4, R5, R7, W, T) (sampling 2, Figure 1b) *L. pneumophila* contamination
210 was revealed using both culture and molecular methods. In particular, a PMA-induced signal
211 reduction of genomic units compared to qPCR was observed, suggesting the presence of a certain
212 proportion of membrane-compromised cells (Ditommaso et al., 2014; Yanez et al., 2011) likely
213 related to the NEOW treatment, as reported with other disinfection systems (Mansi et al. 2014;
214 Marchesi et al., 2016). The effectiveness of the NEOW treatment was also confirmed in samples B,
215 R1, R3, R6 and RL, where a complete reduction of genomic units was observed using PMA-qPCR.
216 During the following sampling campaigns, the number of positive samples did not change
217 substantially over time (Table 2). However, the percentage of heavily contaminated points (*L.*
218 *pneumophila* loads $> 10^4$ CFU/L and $> 10^3$ CFU/L) dropped to 0% already after 1 week and 2
219 months of treatment, respectively. A general reduction of *L. pneumophila* contamination (< 2 Log
220 CFU/L or UG/L) was observed during samplings 3, 4 and 5 (Figure 1 c,d,e), but the highest *L.*
221 *pneumophila* concentrations were observed in the wellness area (samples W and T) in sampling 3
222 (Figure 1c). This could represent a possible risk due to the formation of aerosol, which can promote
223 the spread of *Legionella* (Ahmed et al., 2013; Cuhna et al., 2016; Euser et al., 2010). Some samples
224 (B, R1, R2, R6, sampling 3, Figure 1c), (R2, R5, R7, W, T, sampling 4, Figure 1d), (RL, D1,
225 sampling 5, Figure 1e) did not show any *L. pneumophila* contamination using culture method and
226 PMA-q-PCR, confirming the effectiveness of the disinfection system over time. However, some
227 samples were positive using the culture method (Figure 1 c, d, e) but PMA caused a complete loss
228 of signal. The same trend was also observed in other studies (Lizana et al., 2017) and was probably
229 due to the lower detection limit of the culture method (1CFU/L) with respect to the molecular one
230 (80G/L). This discrepancy could indicate a limit for the usefulness of PMA-qPCR for the evaluation
231 of *L. pneumophila* contamination in a disinfected water distribution system; however, the difference

was observed only in some cases and only when the contamination levels were very low, below the intervention threshold values.

Overall, the NEOW device, which continuously produces and dispenses hypochlorous acid, allowed a reduction of *L. pneumophila* contamination. ANOVA test confirmed a significant difference in *L. pneumophila* measured by culture method and PMA-qPCR (log CFU/L or log GU/L) among the five sampling campaigns ($F = 20.936$; $p \leq 0.001$ and $F = 29.318$; $p \leq 0.001$). In particular, the post hoc Tukey's test highlighted a statistically significant difference between *L. pneumophila* before (sampling 1) and after (sampling 2-5) the NEOW application ($p \leq 0.001$ for both methods). Treatment maintained contamination at low levels during the three-month observation period, leading to contamination levels $\leq 10^2$ CFU/L that do not require specific intervention measures, according to the Italian guidelines (Ministero della Salute 2015), even if the concentration of *L. pneumophila* was not reduced below the limit of detection in all the sampled points.

In the study of Marchesi et al. (2011), which compared the effectiveness of different disinfection methods, chlorine dioxide (ClO_2) turned out to be more efficient than shock superheating and shock hyperchlorination in reducing *L. pneumophila*. ClO_2 treatment maintained *L. pneumophila* contamination at low levels during the observation period, but did not eradicate it from the system. This trend was similar to what was observed in our study, although ClO_2 , with respect to NEOW, generally requires a prolonged time to reach significant reductions of *L. pneumophila* and a strict control of chlorine injection to prevent malfunctioning. Other studies have shown that the use of monochloramine seemed to be an alternative effective approach; however very high levels of monochloramine (> 3 mg/L) were necessary to obtain *Legionella* spp. reduction $<10^2$ CFU/L (Mancini et al., 2015; Marchesi et al., 2016); another disadvantage includes its complicated on-site generation (Lin et al., 2011). In contrast, NEOW can be easily produced in situ and corrosive phenomena are not known to occur at the concentrations used in water distribution systems (Thorn et al., 2012). Furthermore, other disinfection systems were less efficient in inducing a stable reduction of *L. pneumophila* compared to the NEOW treatment. In most cases, superheating and

hyperchlorination were associated with an initial reduction of contamination, after which values returned to pretreatment levels (Marchesi et al., 2011; Lin et al., 2011). This trend was probably related to the VBNC legionellae generated upon treatment (Marchesi et al., 2016). It would be interesting to investigate the effect of the NEOW treatment on the regrowth of VBNC *Legionella pneumophila* after long periods of time (> 3 months).

263

3.2 Microbiological indicators, physical and chemical analyses

265

The results of the TBC at 22 and 37°C are shown in Figure 1. *Pseudomonas* spp. were not found in any of the samples analysed. A positive and statistically significant correlation (Pearson test) was observed between the *L. pneumophila* concentration and TBC at 22°C ($r = 0.501$; $p \leq 0.01$) or TBC at 37°C ($r = 0.586$; $p \leq 0.01$) as reported in other studies (Bargellini et al., 2011). In accordance to what we observed for *L. pneumophila*, TBCs were affected by the NEOW treatment. ANOVA test confirmed a significant difference among the concentrations of TBCs in the five samplings ($F = 4,017$; $p \leq 0.01$ for TBC 22°C and $F = 7,647$; $p \leq 0,001$ for TBC 37°C). The post hoc Tukey's test highlighted a statistically significant difference between the TBC at 22°C before the NEOW treatment and the fifth sampling campaign ($p \leq 0.01$), and between the TBC at 37°C before the NEOW application and the third (after 1 month) and fifth (after 3 months) sampling campaigns ($p \leq 0.05$ and $p \leq 0.001$ respectively).

Table 3 shows the physicochemical characteristics of the water samples before and after the NEOW treatment. No relationship was observed between physicochemical parameters and *L. pneumophila* concentration.

280

4. Conclusions

282

283 This is the first study to identify the effect of an in situ NEOW treatment on the reduction of *L.*
284 *pneumophila* contamination in a hotel water network.

285 Our study demonstrated the effectiveness of continuous chemical disinfection in the reduction of *L.*
286 *pneumophila* concentration. The use of the NEOW device appears to be a promising approach to
287 reduce colonisation by *L. pneumophila* and has the advantage of a low annual cost of production
288 (0.02 € for 1 litre of NEOW with an active chlorine concentration of 500 mg/L) and the
289 maintenance of a device (approximately 2000 €), which can be remotely controlled for pH and
290 residual chlorine. However, further investigations are needed to ascertain its efficiency over
291 extended time periods since a complete eradication from the water distribution system has not been
292 achieved. Moreover, the results obtained confirmed that PMA-qPCR offers some advantages
293 compared to conventional qPCR also in water samples disinfected with the NEOW device, as it
294 allows to gather information regarding the viability of *Legionella* cells and the presence of VBNC
295 cells, improving the knowledge about the exposure risk to *L. pneumophila*.

296

297 **Acknowledgements**

298 The Authors thank Daniele Tartaro, Fabio Cometto and Alberto Rosso (DueDi s.r.l.) for their
299 technical support and Dr. Francesca Bersani for the language revision.

300

301 **References**

302 Ahmed, M., Laza-Stanca, V., Mustafa, N., 2013. *Legionella pneumophila* outbreak related to a
303 display spa pool at retail unit. Thorax 68, A189-190. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204457.400)
304 204457.400.

305

306 Bargellini, A., Marchesi, I., Righi, E., Ferrari, A., Cencetti, S., Borella, P., Rovesti, S., 2011.
307 Parameters predictive of *Legionella* contamination in hot water systems: association with trace

308 elements and heterotrophic plate counts. Water Res. 45, 2315-2321.
 309 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2011.01.009>.
 310
 311 Bonetta, S., Pignata, C., Bonetta, S., Meucci, L., Giacosa, D., Marino, E., Gilli, G., Carraro, E.,
 312 2017. Viability of *Legionella pneumophila* in Water Samples: A Comparison of Propidium
 313 Monoazide (PMA) Treatment on Membrane Filters and in Liquid. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public
 314 Health 14, pii: E467. doi: 10.3390/ijerph14050467.
 315
 316 Bonetta, S., Bonetta, S., Ferretti, E., Balocco, F., Carraro, E., 2010. Evaluation of *Legionella*
 317 *pneumophila* contamination in Italian hotel water systems by quantitative real-time PCR and culture
 318 methods. J. Appl. Microbiol. 108, 1576-1583. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2672.2009.04553.x.
 319
 320 Casini, B., Buzzigoli, A., Cristina, M.L., Spagnolo, A.M., Del Giudice, P., Brusaferrero, S., Poscia,
 321 A., Moscato, U., Valentini, P., Baggiani, A., Privitera, G., 2014. Long-Term Effects of Hospital
 322 Water Network Disinfection on *Legionella* and Other Waterborne Bacteria in an Italian University
 323 Hospital. Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol. 35, 293 - 299.
 324 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/10.1086/675280.pdf>.
 325
 326 Coetzee, N., Duggal, H., Hawker, J., Ibbotson, S., Harrison, T.G., Phin, N., Laza-Stanca, V.,
 327 Johnston, R., Iqbal, Z., Rehman, Y., Knapper, E., Robinson, S., Aigbogun, N., 2012. An outbreak
 328 of Legionnaires' disease associated with a display spa pool in retail premises, Stoke-on-Trent,
 329 United Kingdom, July 2012. Euro Surveill. 17, pii: 20271.
 330 <http://www.eurosurveillance.org/ViewArticle.aspx?ArticleId=20271>.
 331
 332 Cossali, G., Routledge, E.J., Ratcliffe, M.S., Blakes, H, Fielder, J.E., Karayiannis, T.G., 2016.
 333 Inactivation of *E. coli*, *Legionella*, and *Pseudomonas* in Tap Water Using Electrochemical

334 Disinfection. J. Environ. Eng. 142, 1-11. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)EE.1943-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)EE.1943-)
335 7870.0001134#sthash.NzePrJ2S.dpuf.
336

337 Cunha, C.B., Cunha, B.A., 2017. Legionnaire's Disease since Philadelphia: Lessons Learned and
338 Continued Progress. Infect. Dis. Clin. North Am. 31, 1-5.
339 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.idc.2016.10.001>.
340

341 Cunha, B.A., Burillo, A., Bouza, E. 2016. Legionnaires' disease. Lancet 387 (10016), 376-85.
342 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(15\)60078-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60078-2).
343

344 Delgado-Viscogliosi, P., Solignac, L., Delattre, J.M., 2009. Viability PCR, a culture-independent
345 method for rapid and selective quantification of viable *Legionella pneumophila* cells in
346 environmental water samples. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 75, 3502-3512. doi: 10.1128/AEM.02878-
347 08.
348

349 Ditommaso, S., Giacomuzzi, M., Ricciardi, E., Zotti, C.M., 2016. Cultural and Molecular Evidence
350 of *Legionella* spp. colonization in Dental Unit Waterlines: Which Is the Best Method for Risk
351 Assessment? Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 13, 211. <http://www.mdpi.com/1660->
352 4601/13/2/211/pdf.
353

354 Ditommaso, S., Ricciardi, E., Giacomuzzi, M., Arauco Rivera, S.R., Ceccarelli, A., Zotti, C.M.
355 2014. Overestimation of the *Legionella* spp. load in environmental samples by quantitative real-
356 time PCR: pretreatment with propidium monoazide as a tool for the assessment of an association
357 between *Legionella* concentration and sanitary risk. Diagn. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. 80, 260-266.
358 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2014.09.010>.
359

European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), 2017. Annual Epidemiological Report for 2015 – Legionnaires’ Disease. 2016 [cited 2017, November 15th].
https://ecdc.europa.eu/sites/portal/files/documents/AER_for_2015-legionnaires-disease_0.pdf

Euser, S.M., Pelgrim, M., den Boer, J.W., 2010. Legionnaires' disease and Pontiac fever after using a private outdoor whirlpool spa. *Scand. J. Infect. Dis.* 42, 910-916.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/00365548.2010.509331>.

International Standards Organisation (ISO), 1998. Water quality -- Detection and enumeration of *Legionella*. ISO 11731, Geneva, Switzerland.

International Standards Organisation (ISO), 1999. Water quality -- Enumeration of culturable micro-organisms -- Colony count by inoculation in a nutrient agar culture medium. ISO 6222, Geneva, Switzerland.

International Standards Organisation (ISO), 2004. Water quality -- Detection and enumeration of *Legionella* -- Part 2: Direct membrane filtration method for waters with low bacterial counts. ISO 11731-2, Geneva, Switzerland.

International Standards Organisation (ISO), 2006. Water quality -- Detection and enumeration of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* -- Method by membrane filtration, Geneva, Switzerland.

Issa-Zacharia, A., Kamitani, Y., Tiisekwa, A., Morita, K., Iwasaki, K., 2010. In vitro inactivation of *Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Salmonella* spp. using slightly acidic electrolyzed water. *J. Biosci. Bioeng.* 110, 308-313. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiosc.2010.03.012>.

386 Li, J., Li, K., Zhou, Y., Li, X., Tao, T., 2017. Kinetic analysis of *Legionella* inactivation using
 387 ozone in wastewater. *Chemosphere* 168, 630-637. doi: 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.11.014.
 388
 389 Lin, Y.E., Stout, J.E., Yu, V.L., 2011. Controlling *Legionella* in hospital drinking water: an
 390 evidence-based review of disinfection methods. *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* 32, 166-73.
 391 <https://doi.org/10.1086/657934>.
 392
 393 Lizana, X., Lopez, A., Benito, S., Augusti, G., Rios, M., Pique, N., Marques, A.M., Codony, F.,
 394 2017. Viability qPCR, a new tool for *Legionella* risk management. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* 220,
 395 1318-1324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2017.08.007>
 396
 397 Mancini, B., Scurti, M., Dormi, A., Grottola, A., Zanotti, A., 2015. Effect of monochloramine
 398 treatment on colonization of a hospital water distribution system by *Legionella* spp.: a 1-year
 399 experience study. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 49, 4551-4558. doi: 10.1021/es506118e.
 400
 401 Mansi, A., Amori, I., Marchesi, I., Marcelloni, A.M., Proietto, A.R., Ferranti, G., Magini, V.,
 402 Valeriani, F., Borella, P., 2014. *Legionella* spp. survival after different disinfection procedures:
 403 Comparison between conventional culture, qPCR and EMA-qPCR. *Microchem. J.* 112, 65-69.
 404 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.microc.2013.09.017>.
 405
 406 Marchesi, I., Marchegiano, P., Bargellini, A., Cencetti, S., Frezza, G., Miselli, M., Borella, P., 2011.
 407 Effectiveness of different methods to control *Legionella* in the water supply: ten-year experience in
 408 an Italian university hospital. *J. Hosp. Infect.* 77, 47-51.
 409 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2010.09.012>.
 410

411 Marchesi, I., Ferranti, G., Mansi, A., Marcelloni, A.M., Proietto, A.R., Saini, N., Borella, P.,
 412 Bargellini, A., 2016. Control of *Legionella* Contamination and Risk of Corrosion in Hospital Water
 413 Networks following Various Disinfection Procedures. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 82, 2959-2965.
 414 doi: 10.1128/AEM.03873-15.
 415
 416 Ministero della Salute, 2015. Linee guida per la prevenzione ed il controllo della legionellosi.
 417 www.salute.gov.it/imgs/C_17_pubblicazioni_2362_allegato.pdf.
 418
 419 Mouchtouri, V.A., Rudge, J.W., 2015. Legionnaires' Disease in Hotels and Passenger Ships: A
 420 Systematic Review of Evidence, Sources, and Contributing Factors. J. Travel Med. 22, 325-337.
 421 doi: 10.1111/jtm.12225.
 422
 423 Park, H., Hung, Y.C., Chung, D., 2004. Effects of chlorine and pH on efficacy of electrolyzed water
 424 for inactivating *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and *Listeria monocytogenes*. Int. J. Food Microbiol. 91,
 425 13-8. doi: 10.1016/S0168-1605(03)00334-9.
 426
 427 Rahman, S.M.E., Khan, I., Oh, D.H., 2016. Electrolyzed Water as a Novel Sanitizer in the Food
 428 Industry: Current Trends and Future Perspectives. Compr. Rev. Food Sci. Food Safety 15, 471-490.
 429 doi: 10.1111/1541-4337.12200.
 430
 431 Rice, E.W., Baird, R.B., Eaton, A.D., Clesceri, L.S., 2012. Standard Methods for the Examination
 432 of Water and Wastewater, 22nd Edition. American Public Health Association, American Water
 433 Works Association, Water Environment Federation. ISBN: 9780875530130.
 434
 435 Scaturro, M., Fontana, S., Dell'eva, I., Helfer, F., Marchio, M., Stefanetti, M.V., Cavallaro, M.,
 436 Miglietta, M., Montagna, M.T., De Giglio, O., Cuna, T., Chetti, L., Sabattini, M.A., Carlotti, M.,

437 Viggiani, M., Stenico, A., Romanin, E., Bonanni, E., Ottaviano, C., Franzin, L., Avanzini, C.,
 438 Demarie, V., Corbella, M., Cambieri, P., Marone, P., Rota, M.C., Bella, A., Ricci, M.L., 2016. A
 439 multicenter study of viable PCR using propidium monoazide to detect *Legionella* in water samples.
 440 Diagn. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. 85, 283-288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2016.04.009>.
 441
 442 Thorn, R.M., Lee, S.W., Robinson, G.M., Greenman, J., Reynolds, D.M., 2012. Electrochemically
 443 activated solutions: evidence for antimicrobial efficacy and applications in healthcare environments.
 444 Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. 31, 641-653. doi: 10.1007/s10096-011-1369-9.
 445
 446 Yáñez, M.A., Nocker, A., Soria-Soria, E., Múrtula, R., Martínez, L., Catalán, V., 2011.
 447 Quantification of viable *Legionella pneumophila* cells using propidium monoazide combined with
 448 quantitative PCR. J. Microbiol. Methods 85, 124-130.
 449 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2011.02.004>.
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462

Figure 1. Results of *Legionella pneumophila* contamination (culture, qPCR and PMA-qPCR) and TBC at 22 °C and 37 °C in all sites during the five sampling campaigns.

a)

490

b)

491

c)

492

d)


493

e)

494

495

496



497 **Table 1.** Description of sampling sites.
498

Sampling sites	Water	Samples	Sampling point
Inlet of water system*	cold	Inlet before the water treatment (I)	tap
Boiler	hot	Boiler (B)	tap
Return loop	hot	Return loop (RL)	tap
Distal outlets - Rooms	hot	Room (floor 0) (R1)	tap
		Room (floor 1) (R2)	shower
		Room (floor 2) (R3)	tap
		Room (floor 3) (R4)	shower
		Room (floor 3) (R5)	shower
		Room (floor 4) (R6)	tap
		Room (floor -1) (R7)	tap
Wellness area	hot	Whirlpool (W)	tap
		Dressing room (D1)	shower
		Turkish bath (T)	shower
		Dressing room (D2)	tap

499 * This sampling site was located outside the building but belonging to mains. In this point water was not treated with
500 chlorine and it was not affected by the NEOW treatment.
501

502
503 **Table 2.** Percentage of sampling sites contaminated by *L. pneumophila* and the level of
504 contamination in the water distribution system before and after the NEOW device installation.

	Before	After NEOW			
		1 week	1 month	2 month	3 month
<i>L. pneumophila</i>					
positive, n (%)	13/13* (100%)	7/10 (70%)	9/13 (69%)	8/13 (62%)	8/11 (73%)
Mean CFU/L	9.050	299	219	5	11
>10 ⁴ CFU/L, n (%)	5/13 (38%)	0/10 (0%)	0/13 (0%)	0/13 (0%)	0/11 (0%)
>10 ³ CFU/L, n** (%)	9/13 (69%)	1/10 (10%)	1/13 (7.7%)	0/13 (0%)	0/11 (0%)

505 * The water sample collected at the inlet of the water system (I) was not considered because it was not affected by the NEOW
506 treatment

507 ** The number includes also samples with CFU/L >10⁴
508

509 **Table 3.** Physicochemical parameters (mean ± SD) measured at the inlet of the hotel water system
510 and in the water distribution system before and after the NEOW device installation.

	Temp °C	pH	Conductivity µS/cm	Turbidity NTU	Ammonium mg/L	Free residual chlorine mg/L
Inlet (I)	15.24±2.05	8.10±0.00	157.75±1.5	0.44±0.22	0.01±0.01	< 0.03*
Sampling 1	22.16±2.41	8.10±0.04	157.84±1.28	0.83±0.59	0.02±0.01	< 0.03*
Sampling 2	38.47±5.73	8.06±0.05	286.23±41.63	0.90±0.61	0.02±0.01	0.15±0.04
Sampling 3	37.71±4.78	8.01±0.04	181.85±13.25	0.86±0.42	0.01±0.01	0.13±0.06
Sampling 4	37.44±0.90	8.11±0.09	220.77±10.88	0.60±0.37	0.01±0.01	0.17±0.05
Sampling 5	38.71±1.44	ND	ND	0.67±0.33	0.01±0.01	0.10±0.02

511 * Before the NEOW device installation, water at the inlet and in the distribution system was not treated with chlorine.

512 ND: not detected.
513