

Comparative Antibacterial Effect of Different Sanitizer

B. Mohanapriya¹ and Dr. K. Devimaliga²

Research Scholar, Department of Microbiology¹

Head & Asst Professor, Department of Microbiology²

Kamban College of Arts and Science for Women, Tiruvannamalai, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract: Hand cleanliness especially hand disinfecting is fundamental in diminishing irresistible infection transmission. Concerning the acknowledge that hand cleanliness is an essential for the counteraction of sickness, the traditional technique for washing hand with cleanser has turned out to be very non well known. Rather it is the utilization and hand sanitizer, which has progressively turned into the technique for decision because of its different benefits, in the current review the invitro bacterial movement of two notable brands of hand sanitizer accessible in research facility was directed by agar defenselessness test least inhibitory fixation test and in-vitro decrease of reasonable microscopic organism depends on hands of subjects methods. Reference bacterial strains like *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Bacillus subtilis* were treated with various centralization of every sanitizer showed great outcome: Antibacterial movement of these sanitizer unique in relation to one another. Expanded fixation (25ul 50ul 75ul and 1000) of Purell showed great outcomes, where as lesser focuses (0.5ul 10ul 15ul 20ul) haven't showed the antibacterial movement. On account of the Purell all the fixation (from lower to higher) showed great outcomes the Purell lot more grounded than Purell in the antibacterial movement having deep rooted restraint zones against both gram positive and gram negative microscopic organism.

Keywords: Hand sanitizer, antimicrobial agent. Purell Valley inhibitory concentration, susceptibility test

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1]. Aiello AE, Larson E (2002) What is the evidence for causal link between hygiene and infection. *Lancet infect Dis* 2: 103-110.
- [2]. Amrutha Y, Shruthik, Aravindanarayana V, Prarthana J, Comparative assessment of antimicrobial efficacy of hand sanitizer as antiseptic solution: an in vitro study 2020.
- [3]. Erasmus V, Richardus JH, Vos MC, Oenema A, van Beeck EF. Improving hand hygiene behaviour of nurses using action planning: A pilot study in the intensive care unit and surgical ward. *J Hosp Infect* 2010; 76: 161-4.
- [4]. Hassan AO, Hassan RO, Muhibi MA, Adebimpe WO. A survey of Enterobacteriaceae in hospital and community acquired infections among adults in a tertiary health institution in Southwestern Nigeria. *Afr J Microbiol Res* 2012; 6: 5162-7.
- [5]. Hedderwick S, McNeil S, Lyons M, Kauffman C (2000) Pathogenic organisms associated with artificial finger nails worn by health care workers. *Infection control Hosp Epidemiol* 21: 505-509.
- [6]. Ichor T, Aondoakaa EM and Ebah EE. Comparative studies on the antibacterial activity of alcohol-based hand sanitizer against bacteria isolates from the hands of undergraduate student of university of agriculture, Makurdi, 2018.
- [7]. Jackson (2015) Focus: Antimicrobial resistance: Topical antiseptics in health care clinical laboratory science. *J Amer Soc Med Tech* 18: 160-169.
- [8]. Koskovich, S., dan Stone, M. 2007. Hand Sanitizer Satisfaction Protocol. Diakses 3 September 2010, dari www.sccs.swarthmore.edu/org/.../handouts/Satisfaction.20070218.pdf
- [9]. Larson, E.L, Cimiotti, J., Haas, J., Parides, M., Nesin, M., Latta, P., Saiman, L. 2005. Effect of Antiseptic Hand washing vs Alcohol Sanitizer on Health Care-Associated Infections in Neonatal Intensive Care Units. *American Medical Association*, Vol 199, 377- 383. *Disinfectant* 2000; 31: 136-4.

- [10]. Lindberg E, Adlerberth I, Hesselmar B, Saalman R, Strannegard A et al., (2004) High rate of transfer Staphylococcus aureus from parental skin to infant gut flora. J Clin Microbiol 42:530-534.
- [11]. Linda K.M. Olson, Dan J. Morse, Collette Duley, Brenon K. Savell. 2012. Prospective, randomized in vivo comparison of a dual-active waterless antiseptic versus two alcohol-only waterless antiseptics for surgical hand antisepsis. American Journal of Infection Control, 40:155-1
- [12]. Madan K, Prashar N, Thakral S. Comparative evaluation of efficacy of alcoholic vs. non-alcoholic hand sanitizers. Int J Life Science Biotechnol Pharma Res 2012; 1:173-7.
- [13]. Mondale S, Kolhapure SA. Evaluation of the antimicrobial efficacy and safety of pure hand herbal hand sanitizer in hand hygiene on inanimate objects. Antiseptic 2004; 101:55-7. 14. Musa EK, Desai N, Case well MN (1990) The survival of *Acinetobacter calcoaceticus* inoculated on fingertips and formica. J Hosp Infect 15:219-217.
- [14]. Pittet D, Allegranzi B, Byce J. The World Health Organization guidelines on hand hygiene in health care and their consensus recommendations. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2009; 30:611-22.
- [15]. Pratt RJ, Pellowe CE et al. The epic project: Developing national evidence-based guidelines for preventing healthcare associated infections. Phase 1: Guidelines for preventing hospital-acquired infections. Department of Health (England). J Hosp Infect 2001; 47 Suppl 1: S3-82.
- [16]. Ray SK, Amarchand R, Srikanth J, Manjun D (2012) A study on prevalence of bacteria on the hands of children and their perception on hand washing in two schools in Bangalore and Kolkata. Ind J public health 55:293-297.
- [17]. Son C, Chuck T, Childers T, Usiak S, Dowling M, Andiel C, et al. Practically speaking: Rethinking hand hygiene improvement programs in health care settings. Am J Infect Control 2011; 39:716-24.
- [18]. Watutantrige R, Premalatha P, Lum W, Evelyn C (2012) A study on hand contamination and hand washing practices among medical students. ISRN public Health pp: 1-5.
- [19]. Liu, P., Yuen, Y., Hsiao, H.M., Jaykus, Moe, C. 2010. Effectiveness of Liquid Soap and Hand Sanitizer against Norwalk Virus on Contaminated Hands. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, p. 394-399 Vol. 76.