

MINIREVIEW – Food Microbiology

Photoinactivation of bacteria by endogenous photosensitizers and exposure to visible light of different wavelengths – a review on existing data

M. Hessling^{1,*,\dagger}, B. Spellerberg² and K. Hoenes¹¹Institute of Medical Engineering and Mechatronics, Ulm University of Applied Sciences, Ulm, Germany and²Institute of Medical Microbiology and Hygiene, University of Ulm, Ulm, Germany

*Corresponding author: Institute of Medical Engineering and Mechatronics, Ulm University of Applied Sciences, Albert-Einstein-Allee 55, D-89081 Ulm, Germany. Tel: +49 (0) 731 5028602; Fax +49 (0) 731 5028505; E-mail: hessling@hs-ulm.de

One sentence summary: Visible violet and blue light is capable of disinfecting all bacteria investigated so far.

Editor: Wolfgang Kneifel

^{\dagger}M. Hessling, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4859-2864>

ABSTRACT

Visible light has strong disinfectant properties, a fact that is not well known in comparison to the antibacterial properties of UV light. This review compiles the published data on bacterial inactivation caused by visible light and endogenous photosensitizers. It evaluates more than 50 published studies containing information on about 40 different bacterial species irradiated within the spectral range from 380 to 780 nm. In the available data a high variability of photoinactivation sensitivity is observed, which may be caused by undefined illumination conditions. Under aerobic conditions almost all bacteria except spores should be reduced by at least three log-levels with a dose of about 500 J cm⁻² of 405 nm irradiation, including both Gram-positive as well as Gram-negative microorganisms. Irradiation of 470 nm is also appropriate for photoinactivating all bacteria species investigated so far but compared to 405 nm illumination it is less effective by a factor between 2 and 5. The spectral dependence of the observed photoinactivation sensitivities gives reason to the assumption that a so far unknown photosensitizer may be involved at 470 nm photoinactivation.

Keywords: photoinactivation; endogenous photosensitizer; visible light; bactericidal

INTRODUCTION

The first studies on the disinfecting properties of visible light were conducted in the late 19th century by researchers such as Arthur Downes and Thomas Porter Blunt as well as Theodor Geisler (Downes and Blunt 1877, 1878; Geisler 1890). Among the pioneers of the field, Percy F. Frankland and H. Marshall Ward reported the disinfecting properties of light on *Bacillus anthracis* (Frankland and Ward 1894; Ward 1894). Most of the very early studies were conducted with the use of sunlight and it was not always possible to precisely delineate the influence of UV radiation on the disinfecting aspects these pioneers noted. However,

employing various filters and prisms, Ward could show that the wavelength played a very important role in the bactericidal response – as depicted in Fig. 1 – and that the bactericidal effect was strongest for the shortest wavelength (UV spectrum). Moreover these studies led to the discovery that inhibition of bacterial growth ceased at the border between green and blue light. While these studies are also the first to demonstrate the antibacterial properties of visible light, in the historical perspective these early pioneers are typically regarded as the discoverers of the disinfecting effect of ultraviolet light (UV light), which is generally known and accepted.

Received: 29 October 2016; Accepted: 25 November 2016

© FEMS 2016. All rights reserved. For permissions, please e-mail: journals.permissions@oup.com




Figure 1. Photograph of an agar plate with *B. anthracis* colonies taken from (Ward 1894). A prism dispersed solar radiation into red (R), green (G), blue (B) and violet (V) light. Bacterial inhibition was observed for the violet, blue and green part of the visible spectrum (Ward 1894).

The UV part of the electromagnetic spectrum is subdivided by its wavelength into three sections: UV-C, 100–280 nm; UV-B, 280–315 nm; and UV-A, 315–380 nm. It is followed by the visible spectral region from 380 to 780 nm. UV-C light is known to be the most effective radiation for the reduction of bacteria, fungi and protozoa, which is caused by the destruction of DNA and RNA (Chevrefils and Caron 2006). However, damage to nucleotides extends to human DNA and represents a considerable disadvantage of using UV light for disinfection.

In contrast to all kinds of UV radiation, visible light is much less harmful (Kleinpenning *et al.* 2010; McDonald *et al.* 2013; Ramakrishnan *et al.* 2014, 2016). It can be applied without higher risks in case of accidental or even intentional illumination of human tissue. An important aspect of the antibacterial effect of visible light is the presence of bacterial photosensitizers. It has gradually been recognized that many bacteria harbor a sufficiently high concentration of endogenous photosensitizers for them to be destroyed from within by intensive irradiation with visible light, especially by violet and blue light of wavelengths 405 and 470 nm, respectively (Ashkenazi *et al.* 2003; Guffey and Wilborn 2006; Maclean *et al.* 2008b). The porphyrins coproporphyrin III, protoporphyrin IX and uroporphyrin III have been identified as the primary endogenous photosensitizers responsible for bacterial photoinactivation (Ashkenazi *et al.* 2003; Feuerstein *et al.* 2005; Maclean *et al.* 2008a,b). Absorption of visible light by these photosensitizers generates reactive oxygen species (ROS) that damage nearby cell structures leading to cell death.

So far this photoinactivation effect has been investigated for about 40 different bacterial species and was even extended to some fungi and viruses. The intention of this review is to compile the existing data on bacterial inactivation for different wavelengths, and to discuss potential reasons for the variations of disinfection success reported in the published data. The observed wavelength dependence of the photoinactivation was also compared to the spectral properties of the assumed involved photosensitizers. Moreover we want to address potential improvements for future experimental setups and to investigate if it is possible to recommend irradiation doses for visible light, similar to the recommendation of 40 mJ cm⁻² for UV-C irradiation that can be found in international standards (DIN EN 14897 2007).

DISINFECTION WITH VISIBLE LIGHT IN THE MEDICAL AND FOOD SECTOR

The fact that visible light is quite innocuous for human cells represents an enormous advantage with regard to medical applications. The first successful *in vivo* results were published for the treatment of acne vulgaris (Papageorgiou, Katsambas and Chu 2000; Kawada *et al.* 2002; Elman, Slatkine and Harth 2003) and wound infections (Lipovsky *et al.* 2010; Dai *et al.* 2012, 2013; McDonald *et al.* 2013; Zhang *et al.* 2014). Even the successful photoinactivation of *Helicobacter pylori* in the stomachs of human patients has been reported (Ganz *et al.* 2005; Lembo *et al.* 2009) and further medical applications are emerging. Potential future fields of operation are the disinfection of air and surfaces (Murdoch *et al.* 2012; Maclean *et al.* 2014) as well as the disinfection of contact lenses (Hoenes *et al.* 2016; Hoenes, Vogelaar and Hessling 2016).

Another large field of potential applications for photoinactivation by visible light is the conservation and disinfection of food (Luksiene and Brovko 2013; D'Souza *et al.* 2015). So far, reported photoinactivation experiments on real food and obtained without UV radiation are still rare. Among the few published results are the successful disinfection of *Listeria monocytogenes* and *Campylobacter* spp. on hot dogs and chicken surfaces (Haughton *et al.* 2012; Motts *et al.* 2016), respectively, as well as the photoinactivation of *Escherichia coli* in milk (Srimagal, Ramesh and Sahu 2016).

COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF BACTERIAL DISINFECTION STUDIES

To assess the effects of visible light of different wavelengths on Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria, the PubMed database was first searched for different combinations of the key words photoinactivation, endogenous photosensitizer, disinfection, inactivation, bactericidal, visible light, violet light and blue light. In a second step the references in the resulting literature were scanned, as were all papers that cited any discovered articles in PubMed or Google Scholar. Among the identified studies only *in vitro* data were further evaluated in which bacteria in liquid suspensions were irradiated with visible light of one wavelength within the range of 380–780 nm and a specified irradiation dose. Excluded were studies using combinations of different wavelengths or wide spectral ranges, or radiation with UV or IR (infra-red), as were reports on combinations of visible light with additional measures such as extreme temperatures (not within 15–40°C), acidity (not within pH 6–8) or the combination with chemical disinfectants, additional photosensitizers, or nutrient supplements influencing the bacterial porphyrin production.

The data for each strain were included separately in the evaluation and the same was done for each bacterial starting concentration. Most authors have published a series of photoinactivation experiments. In this case usually the value for the highest evaluable irradiation dose was listed. In the case of zero survivors a lower dose was chosen to enable the evaluation that was based on the simplified assumption of a negative exponential dependence between the concentration of surviving bacteria and irradiation dose, usually represented as a straight line in a half-logarithmic diagram. Any observed tailing or shouldering of this dependence was neglected and only the average value for a bacterial concentration reduction of one log-level (change by a factor of 10) was calculated. This method was chosen to ensure that the many different published results with irradiation dose variations of up to three orders of magnitude became

comparable. If figures of disinfection results were published not mentioning exact values in the text, values were extracted from the (magnified) figures. The error associated with this technique is negligible compared to the large variations in the published results.

A compilation of all these results can be found in Table 1, including about 250 data sets for about 40 different bacterial species. Successful photoinactivation data of Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria and the necessary irradiation doses for a log reduction in dependence of the wavelength is depicted in Fig. 2.

DATA VARIABILITY AND POSSIBLE EXPERIMENTAL REASONS

A major finding in analyzing the available publications was an unexpected large variability in the calculated irradiation dose necessary for a one log reduction for a specific bacterial species at a certain wavelength (Table 1). The observed differences are up to one order of magnitude. Strain differences among the same species do certainly play a role with regard to this high data variability, but variation is even observed if only a single strain is evaluated such as *Staphylococcus aureus* NCTC 4135. For this strain the irradiation doses for a one log reduction varied between 7.2 and 60.8 J cm⁻² at 405 nm and the variation even increased when comparing different *S. aureus* isolates. In this case the data were generated by various working groups and setups. However, if only the results of a single working group and a single setup are taken into account minor variability was reported even for different strains, as for example by Halstead et al. for *A. baumannii* and *S. aureus* (Halstead et al. 2016), a finding which suggests that experimental measurement setups and procedures may be unintended origins of these variations.

INFLUENCE OF ILLUMINATION DURATION, DOSE OR BACTERIAL CONCENTRATION

Comparing the experimental setups of the studies in Table 1, the largest differences are illumination duration (2–975 min), illumination dose (2.1–3000 J cm⁻²) and bacterial concentration (150–10⁹ CFU ml⁻¹). For discussing whether these differences are responsible for the high variability of the log reduction dose, its dependence on these three variables is investigated. Most data exist for 405 nm irradiation of *E. coli* and *S. aureus*. Figure 3a–c depicts exemplarily the dependence of the necessary radiation dose for one log reduction, in relation to illumination duration, actually applied illumination dose and bacterial starting concentration, respectively.

In Fig. 3a we evaluated the dependence of the irradiation dose for a one log-level reduction on the illumination duration for *E. coli* and *S. aureus*. A linear regression delivers an increase of the necessary dose for *E. coli* and a decrease for *S. aureus* with the illumination duration, but the square regression coefficients R^2 of 0.15 and 0.16 for *E. coli* and *S. aureus* imply that the influence of illumination duration is almost negligible and cannot explain the observed variability.

A similar comparison is depicted in Fig. 3b for the dependence of the calculated necessary radiation dose for a one log-level decrease of the bacterial concentration on the actually applied radiation dose. For both bacterial species the linear regression results in an increase of the necessary log reduction dose on the applied dose, but the square regression coefficients

R^2 are even smaller than 0.16. Therefore no significant dependence between both parameters could be observed.

Maclean et al. (2009) and Bumah et al. (2013) investigated the influence of bacterial starting concentrations on the efficacy of 405 nm *S. aureus* inactivation. They observed a reduced disinfection efficacy and a significant decrease of the irradiation intensity in samples with higher bacterial concentrations (included in Fig. 3c). The complete data collection shows an increase of the log reduction dose with rising bacterial concentrations, but once again the square regression coefficients are very low, indicating that the data variability cannot merely be explained by differing bacterial concentrations.

If only the data set of Bumah et al. (2013) on photoinactivation of *S. aureus* by 405 nm radiation is investigated, the impression arises that the results with differing irradiation intensities cannot easily be explained by absorption effects. Bumah et al. performed measurements with 3×10^6 CFU ml⁻¹ and 7×10^6 CFU ml⁻¹ and observed an increase by a factor of 3 for the necessary irradiation dose for a one log reduction when increasing the bacterial concentration from 3×10^6 to 7×10^6 CFU ml⁻¹. The illumination intensity was 25 mW cm⁻² in front of the bacterial suspension and 7 mW cm⁻² behind it for the 7×10^6 CFU ml⁻¹ concentration. By the assumption of a pure absorption effect Lambert-Beer Law would result in an average intensity that is 30% lower in the sample with 7×10^6 CFU ml⁻¹ compared to the sample with 3×10^6 CFU ml⁻¹. This difference may even be lower, because bacteria were suspended in a non-absorbing saline solution. The observed attenuation of the illumination may alternatively be explained by scattering. Scattering will lead to multiple reflections of the radiation within the sample, resulting in an average illumination intensity that is possibly even higher in the sample with 7×10^6 CFU ml⁻¹. Why the data of Bumah et al. demonstrate an increase by a factor of 3 for the irradiation dose cannot, therefore, be sufficiently explained.

INFLUENCE OF OXYGEN CONCENTRATION

Another factor important for the disinfecting properties of visible light is oxygen. Maclean et al. (2008a) reported that the photoinactivation of *S. aureus* is highly dependent on the oxygen concentration in samples with bacterial concentrations of more than 10⁵ CFU ml⁻¹. At higher bacterial concentrations oxygen may be consumed faster than it is resupplied by diffusion through the sample surface. This would lead to a lower bacterial photoinactivation sensitivity. It may also explain the outlier in Fig. 3c where at a bacterial concentration of 10⁹ CFU ml⁻¹ a relatively low log-level reduction dose was observed. In that specific setup a magnetic stirrer was employed, which results in an improved oxygen distribution in liquid samples.

Unfortunately direct measurements of oxygen concentrations have not been reported in any published paper, though oxygen may have a large influence. Riedel et al. observed oxygen consumption rates between 3.3×10^{-10} μmol O₂ CFU⁻¹ day⁻¹ and 2.4×10^{-7} μmol O₂ CFU⁻¹ day⁻¹ for *E. coli* under nutrient-limited conditions (Riedel et al. 2013). By these values a bacterial population of 10⁸ CFU ml⁻¹, as employed by some authors in Table 1, would need between 17 min and 9 days to consume 0.284 μmol O₂ ml⁻¹ (dissolved oxygen per milliliter at 20°C), if the resupply by diffusion is neglected. In most photoinactivation papers bacterial solutions were diluted in PBS or NaCl solutions which results in nutrient-limited conditions and therefore probably very low oxygen consumption rates. Nevertheless this oxygen consumption may still influence the dissolved oxygen

Table 1. Photoinactivation results reported for different bacteria and wavelengths within the visible spectrum.

Bacterium (Gram-positive/-negative)	Wave-length [nm]	Median dose/log-level [μcm^{-2}]	{Dose/log-level [μcm^{-2}]/strain/applied dose [μcm^{-2}]/illumination duration [min]/start concentration [CFU ml^{-1}]} (Reference)
<i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> (-)	400	16.7	{15.3/ACI 616/108/30/1E6}, {18.4/ACI 618/108/30/1E6}, {16.0/ACI 642/108/30/1E6}, {17.6/ACI 648/108/30/1E6}, {16.5/ACI 659/108/30/1E6}, {17.6/ACI 665/108/30/1E6}, {17.0/ACI 671/108/30/1E6}, {17.4/ACI 672/108/30/1E6}, {16.9/ACI 698/108/30/1E6}, {16.1/ACI AYE/108/30/1E6}, {16.0/ACI C60/108/30/1E6}, {15.9/ACI 19606/108/30/1E6} (Halstead et al. 2016)
	405	14.0	{25.7/NCTC 12156/108/180/1.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2009), {2.3/LMG 1041/4.5/15/1.0E3} ² (Ramakrishnan et al. 2014)
	415	17.6	{17.6/US Army clinical isolate/70.2/60/1.0E8} (Zhang et al. 2014)
<i>Aggregatibacter actinomycetem.</i> (-)	460	30.0	{30.0/ATCC 43718/150/2/3.0E7} (Cieplik et al. 2014)
<i>Bacillus atrophaeus</i> (+)	470	110.2	{67.4/?/454/3.0E4}, {153.1/?/300/63/3.0E4} (De Lucca et al. 2012)
<i>Bacillus cereus</i> (+)	405	93.5	{28.4/NCTC 11143/108/45/5.0E4} ² (Maclean et al. 2013); {158.6/ATCC 14579/540/1.0E6} ³ (Kumar et al. 2015)
	520	-	{-/ATCC 14579/540/1.0E6} ^{1,2} (Kumar et al. 2015)
<i>Bacillus cereus</i> spores (+)	405	542.9	{605.3/NCTC 11143/1150/480/5.0E4} ² , {480.6/NCTC 11143/1730/720/5.0E4} ² (Maclean et al. 2013)
	405	638.9	{638.9/?/1150/480/5.0E4} (Maclean et al. 2013)
<i>Bacillus megaterium</i> spores (+)	405	638.9	{638.9/?/1150/480/5.0E4} (Maclean et al. 2013)
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i> (+)	408	69.0	{69.0/DSM 402/300/150/1.0E6} (Hoenes et al. 2015)
	451	100.0	{100.0/DSM 402/300/150/1.0E6} (Hoenes et al. 2015)
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i> spores (+)	405	676.5	{676.5/?/1150/480/5.0E4} (Maclean et al. 2013)
<i>Campylobacter coli</i> (-)	395	0.3	{0.3/1140 DF/2.1/5/1.0E7} ² , {0.3/1662 DF/2.1/5/1.0E7} ² , {0.3/2124 GF/2.1/5/1.0E7} ² (Haughton et al. 2012)
<i>Campylobacter jejuni</i> (-)	395	0.3	{0.6/323 BC/4.2/10/1.0E7} ² , {0.6/1136 DF/4.2/10/1.0E7} ² , {0.3/1135 DF/2.1/5/1.0E7} ² , {0.3/1146/DF/2.1/5/1.0E7} ² , {0.3/1147 DF/2.1/5/1.0E7} ² , {0.3/1354 DF/2.1/5/1.0E7} ² , {0.3/NCTC 11168/2.1/5/1.0E7} ² (Haughton et al. 2012)
	405	3.4	{3.4/LMG 8841/18/30/1.0E5} (Murdoch et al. 2010)
	405	10.2	{10.2/ATCC 13124/45/75/3.0E4} (Maclean et al. 2009)
<i>Clostridium perfringens</i> (+)	405	10.2	{10.2/ATCC 13124/45/75/3.0E4} (Maclean et al. 2009)
<i>Chlostridium difficile</i> (+)	405	13.0	{13.0/NCTC 11204/48/80/5.0E4} (Maclean et al. 2013)
<i>Chlostridium difficile</i> spores (+)	405	251.1	{425.9/NCTC 11204/1150/480/5.0E4} (Maclean et al. 2013), {76.4/NCTC 11204/252/19/4.0E3} (Moorhead et al. 2016)
	405	120.6	{120.6/clinical isolate/63.9/15/1.0E3} ² (McDonald et al. 2013)
<i>Corynebacterium striatum</i> (+)	405	120.6	{120.6/clinical isolate/63.9/15/1.0E3} ² (McDonald et al. 2013)
<i>Elizabethkingia meningoseptica</i> (-)	400	8.0	{8.0/EKIN 502/54/15/1.0E6} (Halstead et al. 2016)
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i> complex (-)	400	92.3	{53.3/ENTCL 525/360/100/1.0E6}, {98.0/ENTCL 801/648/180/1.0E6}, {92.3/ENTCL 804/576/160/1.0E6} (Halstead et al. 2016)
	385	81.0	{81.0/ ATCC 19433/-/120/1.0E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016)
<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i> (+)	405	96.0	{96.0/NCTC 00775/216/360/5.2E5} (Maclean et al. 2009), {43.8/clinical isolate/63.9/15/1.0E3} ² (McDonald et al. 2013), {130.0/ATCC 19433/-/165/1.0E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016)
	430	190.0	{190/ATCC 19433/-/360/1.0E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016)
	455	410.0	{410.0/ATCC 19433/-/360/1.0E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016)
	525	-	{-/ATCC 19433/-/1.0E6} ^{1,3} (Lui et al. 2016)
	590	1 900 000.0	{1 900 000.0/ATCC 19433/-/1.0E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016)
	623	-	{-/ATCC 19433/-/1.0E6} ^{1,3} (Lui et al. 2016)
	660	-	{-/ATCC 19433/-/1.0E6} ^{1,3} (Lui et al. 2016)
	740	-	{-/ATCC 19433/-/1.0E6} ^{1,3} (Lui et al. 2016)
	400	348.4	{348.4/EFM 513/648/180/1.0E6} (Halstead et al. 2016)
	385	61.0	{61.0/ATCC W3110/-/90/1.0E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016)
<i>Escherichia coli</i> (-)	395	25.2	{25.2/DSM 1607/36/19/1.0E8} ² (Birmpa et al. 2014)
	400	46.3	{22.9/EC 073/108/30/1.0E6}, {69.7/EC 042/108/30/1.0E6} (Halstead et al. 2016)
	405	75.6	{86.0/ATCC W3110/-/75/1.0E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016), {21.1/K12 (DH5 α)/132.1/250/-} (Rhodes et al. 2016) {28.6/NCTC 9001/18/60/1.0E3} ² (Ramakrishnan et al. 2014), {58.1/NCTC 9001/180/300/1.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2009), {75.6/NCTC 9001/378/90/1.0E5} (McKenzie et al. 2014), {91.2/ NCTC 9001/702/180/1.0E7} (McKenzie et al. 2016), {122.7/NCTC 12900/554.7/420/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012), {54.3/NCTC 12900/288/480/1.5E5} (Murdoch et al. 2010), {57.6/NCTC 12900/288/480/1.5E5} (Murdoch et al. 2012), {310.0/RDL 933/310/540/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2015), {127.8/clinical isolate/127.8/30/1.0E3} (McDonald et al. 2013)

Table 1 (Continued).

Bacterium (Gram-positive/-negative)	Wave-length [nm]	Median dose/log-level [J cm^{-2}]	{Dose/log-level [J cm^{-2}]/strain/applied dose [J cm^{-2}]/illumination duration [min]/start concentration [CFU ml^{-1}]} (Reference)
	408	156.7	{156.7/DSM 498/600/300/1.0E6} (Hoenes et al. 2015)
	415	60.0	{60.0/ Meir Medical Center isolate 1313/120/20} ² (Lipovsky et al. 2010)
	425	56.1	{56.1/ATCC 25992/86.4/480/2.0E8} ² (Kim et al. 2013)
	430	100.0	{100.0/ATCC W3110/-/300/1.0E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016)
	450	137.6	{137.6/ATCC 25922/117/975/1.5E2} (Keshishyan et al. 2015)
	451	500.0	{500.0/DSM 498/600/300/1.0E6} (Hoenes et al. 2015)
	455	219.3	{138.6/Meir Med. Center isolate 1313/120/20/?} ² (Lipovsky et al. 2010), {300.0/ATCC W3110/-/300/1E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016)
	460	-	{-/ATCC 25992/150/2/3.0E7} ¹ (Cieplik et al. 2014)
	461	309.5	{121.8/EDL 933/596.7/450/1.0E6} ² (Ghate et al. 2013), {497.3/EDL 933/596.7/450/1.0E7} ² (Ghate et al. 2015b)
	520	38750.0	{38750.0/EDL 933/3100/540/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2015)
	521	2859.7	{5400.0/EDL 933/432/450/1.0E7} ² (Ghate et al. 2015b), {319.4/EDL 933/431.2/450/1.0E6} ² (Guffey et al. 2013)
	525	785.5	{785.5/ATCC 25992/172.8/480/2.0E8} ² (Kim et al. 2013)
		-	{-/ATCC W3110/-/1.0E6} ^{1,3} (Lui et al. 2016)
	590	3 100 000.0	{3 100 000.0/ATCC W3110/-/1.0E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016)
	623	32 000 000.0	{32 000 000.0/ATCC W3110/-/1.0E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016)
	625	-	{-/ATCC 25992/172.8/480/2.0E8} ¹ (Kim et al. 2013)
	642	-	{-/EDL 933688/450/1.0E6} ¹ (Guffey et al. 2013)
	660	1 700 300.0	{3 400 000.0/ATCC W3110/-/1.0E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016), {600.0/ATCC 25992/24/-/1.5E3} (de Sousa et al. 2016)
	740	13 000 000.0	{13 000 000.0/ATCC W3110/-/1.0E6} ³ (Lui et al. 2016)
<i>Fusobacterium nucleatum</i> (-)	450	55.3	{55.3/ATCC 25586/94/3/5.0E6} ² (Feuerstein et al. 2005)
<i>ss. Nucleatum</i>	455	17.5	{17.5/ATCC 25586/4.8/1/1.0E8} (Fontana et al. 2015)
<i>ss. vincenti</i>	455	9.8	{9.8/ATCC 49256/4.8/1/1.0E8} (Fontana et al. 2015)
<i>ss. polymorphum</i>	455	4.0	{4.0/ATCC 10953/4.8/1/1.0E8} (Fontana et al. 2015)
	465	361.5	{361.5/ATCC 1594/94/30/5.0E6} ² (Feuerstein, Persman and Weiss 2004)
<i>Fusobacterium periodonticum</i> (-)	455	10.3	{10.3/ATCC 33692/4.8/1/1.0E8} (Fontana et al. 2015)
<i>Helicobacter pylori</i> (-)	405	5.3	{6.4/ATCC 43504/32/5/?} ² (Ganz et al. 2005), {4.3/?/20/3/?} (Hamblin et al. 2005)
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> (-)	400	74.8	{73.3/MDR A/504/140/1.0E6}, {76.2/MDR B/504/140/1.0E6} (Halstead et al. 2016)
	405	46.2	{46.2/NCTC 9633/180/300/1.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2009), {29.7/NCTC 9633/27/90/1.0E3} ² (Ramakrishnan et al. 2014), {101.4/Clinical Isolate/85.2/20/1.0E3} ² (McDonald et al. 2013)
<i>Lactobacillus plantarum</i> (+)	405	374.0	{374.0/ATCC 8014/-/420/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2016)
	460	1121.0	{1121.0/ATCC 8014/-/420/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2016)
	520	-	{-/ATCC 8014/-/420/1.0E6} ^{1,2} (Kumar et al. 2016)
<i>Leuconostoc mesenteroides</i> (+)	470	257.1	{257.1/?/180/38/?} (De Lucca et al. 2012)
<i>Listeria innocua</i> (+)	395	2.3	{2.3/NCTC 11288/2.832/78/1.0E8} (Birmpa et al. 2014)
<i>Listeria ivanovii</i> (+)	405	44.9	{44.9/NCTC 11846/184.9/36/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012)
<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> (+)	400	117.4	{117.4/NCTC 11994/123.3/274/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012)
	405	45.9	{42.0/NCTC 11994/184.9/360/1.0E5}, {85.0/NCTC 11994/123.3/274/1.0E5}, {49.7/NCTC 11994/184.9/36/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012), {21.6/NCTC 11994/108/180/1.5E5} (Murdoch et al. 2012), {16.8/LMG 19944/84/20/1.0E5} (McKenzie et al. 2014), {175.5/ATCC BAA 679/540/1.0E6} ³ (Kumar et al. 2015)
	410	100.2	{100.2/NCTC 11994/123.3/274/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012)
	415	241.8	{241.8/NCTC 11994/123.3/274/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012)
	420	493.2	{493.2/NCTC 11994/123.3/274/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012)
	430	648.9	{648.9/NCTC 11994/123.3/274/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012)
	440	1120.9	{1120.9/NCTC 11994/123.3/274/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012)
	450	3082.5	{3082.5/NCTC 11994/123.3/274/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012)
	461	263.1	{411.5/ATCC BAA 679/596.7/450/1E7} (Ghate et al. 2015b), {114.8/ATCC BAA 679/596.7/450/1E6} ² (Ghate et al. 2013)
	520	4843.8	{4843.8/ATCC BAA 679/3100/540/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2015)
	521	987.0	{1542.9/ATCC BAA 679/432/450/1.0E7} (Ghate et al. 2015b), {431.2/ATCC BAA 679/431.2/450/1E6} ² (Ghate et al. 2013)
	642	-	{-/ATCC BAA 679/688/450/1.0E6} ^{1,2} (Ghate et al. 2013)

Table 1 (Continued).

Bacterium (Gram-positive/-negative)	Wave-length [nm]	Median dose/log-level [μcm^{-2}]	{Dose/log-level [μcm^{-2}]/strain/applied dose [μcm^{-2}]/illumination duration [min]/start concentration [CFU ml^{-1}] (Reference)}
<i>Listeria seeligeri</i> (+)	405	55.9	{55.9/NCTC 11856/184.9/36/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012)
<i>Micrococcus</i> sp. (+)	405	24.9	{24.9/clinical isolate/42.8/10/1.0E3} ² (McDonald et al. 2013)
<i>Mycobacterium smegmatis</i> (+)	405	67.8	{67.8/?/120/200/1.5E5} (Guffey et al. 2013)
<i>Mycobacterium terrae</i> (+)	405	57.6	{57.6/LMG 10394/288/480/1.5E5} (Murdoch et al. 2012)
<i>Porphyromonas gingivalis</i> (-)	405	40.5	{2.8/ATCC 33277/3.42/5/2.0E8} ⁴ , {78.2/ATCC 33277/98.55/5/2.0E8} ⁴ (Hope et al. 2013)
	425	523.6	{523.6/KCTC 5352/172.8/480/2.0E8} ² (Kim et al. 2013)
	450	47.0	{47.0/ATCC 33277/94/3/5.0E6} ² (Feuerstein et al. 2005)
		-	{-/ATCC 33277/94/3/5.0E6} ^{2,4} (Feuerstein et al. 2005)
	455	48.8	{48.0/ATCC 33277/4.8/1/1.0E8} (Fontana et al. 2015)
	465	94.0	{94.0/ATCC 33277/94/30/5.0E6} ² (Feuerstein, Persman and Weiss 2004)
	525	1270.6	{1270.6/KCTC 5352/172.8/480/2.0E8} ² (Kim et al. 2013)
	625	5958.6	{5958.6/KCTC 5352/172.8/480/2.0E8} ² (Kim et al. 2013)
<i>Prevotella intermedia</i> (-)	455	14.5	{14.5/ATCC 25611/4.8/1/1.0E8} (Fontana et al. 2015)
<i>Prevotella melaninogenica</i> (-)	455	7.2	{7.2/ATCC 25845/4.8/1/1.0E8} (Fontana et al. 2015)
<i>Prevotella nigrescens</i> (-)	455	9.8	{9.8/ATCC 33563/4.8/1/1.0E8} (Fontana et al. 2015)
<i>Propionibacterium acnes</i> (+)	405	13.3	{13.3/different/40/-/-} ² (Hamblin et al. 2005)
		-	{-/ATCC 11827/15/-/1.5E5} ^{1,4} (Guffey and Wilborn 2006)
	414	45.0	{45.0/ATCC 6919/225/180/1.4E8} ⁴ (Ashkenazi et al. 2003)
	470	-	{-/ATCC 11827/15/-/1.5E5} ^{1,4} (Guffey and Wilborn 2006)
<i>Proteus vulgaris</i> (-)	405	30.6	{30.6/CN 329/144/240/1.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2009)
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> (-)	400	17.8	{16.7/PSE 568/108/30/1.0E6}, {19.3/PSE PA01/108/30/1.0E6}, {16.5/PSE 6749/108/30/1.0E6}, {18.0/PSE 1054/108/30/1.0E6}, {17.8/PSE 1586/108/30/1.0E6} (Halstead et al. 2016)
	405	15.3	{15.3/ATCC 27853/15/30/7.5E4} (Guffey and Wilborn 2006), {42.9/NCTC 9009/180/300/1.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2009), {1409.1/ATCC 10145/310/540/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2015), {15.3/LMG 9009/9/30/1.0E3} ² (Ramakrishnan et al. 2014), {10.5/Clinical isolate/18/4/1.0E3} (McDonald et al. 2013)
	415	14.0	{14.4/ATCC 19660/109.9/96/1.0E8} (Dai et al. 2013), {13.6/ATCC 19660/48/40/1.0E8} (Amin et al. 2016)
	450	142.7	{142.7/ATCC 27853/117/975/1.5E2} (Keshishyan et al. 2015)
	470	69.1	{69.1/ATCC 27853/15/-/7.5E4} (Guffey and Wilborn 2006), {25.4/?/10/454/3.0E4} (De Lucca et al. 2012), {72.5/?/50/63/3.0E4} (De Lucca et al. 2012)
	520	-	{-/ATCC 10145/3100/540/1.0E6} ^{1,3} (Kumar et al. 2015)
	660	64.9	{64.9/ATCC 27853/24/1.5E3} (D'Souza et al. 2015)
<i>Serratia marcescens</i> (-)	405	169.6	{169.6/Clinical isolate/191.7/45/1.0E3} ² (McDonald et al. 2013)
<i>Salmonella enterica</i> (-)	405	97.3	{543.8/NCTC 4444/739.6/144/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012), {97.3/NCTC 4444/288/480/1.0E5} (Murdoch et al. 2010), {82.3/NCTC 4444/288/480/1.5E5} (Murdoch et al. 2012)
('Heidelberg')	470	138.4	{138.4/ATCC 8326/110/-/1.0E6} (Bumah, Masson-Meyers and Enwemeka 2015b)
<i>Salmonella Typhimurium</i> (-)	405	516.7	{516.7/ATCC 14028/310/540/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2015)
	461	917.3	{129.7/ATCC 14028/596.7/450/1.0E6} ² (Ghate et al. 2013), {1704.9/ATCC 14028/596.7/450/1.0E7} (Ghate et al. 2015a)
	470	94.8	{94.8/ATCC 14028/110/-/1.0E6} (Bumah, Masson-Meyers and Enwemeka 2015b)
	520	8611.1	{8611.1/ATCC 14028/3100/540/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2015)
	521	1476.8	{2700.0/ATCC 14028/432/450/1.0E7} (Ghate et al. 2015a), {253.6/ATCC 14028/431.2/450/1.0E6} ² (Ghate et al. 2013)
	642	-	{-/ATCC 14028/688/450/1.0E6} ^{1,2} (Ghate et al. 2013)
<i>Shigella sonnei</i> (-)	405	89.5	{142.2/LMG 10473/554.7/11/1.0E5} (Endarko et al. 2012), {36.7/NCTC 12984/180/300/1.5E5} (Murdoch et al. 2012)
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> (+)	400	16.5	{17.5/MRSA 508/108/30/1.0E6}, {7.9/MRSA 520/54/15/1.0E6}, {16.8/MRSA 531/108/30/1.0E6}, {40.7/MSSA 10788/288/80/1.0E6}, {16.0/MSSA F77/108/30/1.0E6}, {16.0/MSSA 29213/108/30/1.0E6}, {16.1/MSSA 10442/108/30/1E6}, {41.1/MSSA 33807/288/80/1E6}, {47.4/MSSA 4163/288/80/1E6} (Halstead et al. 2016), {15.7/NCTC 4135/23.5/120/2.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2008b)

Table 1 (Continued).

Bacterium (Gram-positive/-negative)	Wave-length [nm]	Median dose/log-level [J cm ⁻²]	{Dose/log-level [J cm ⁻²]/strain/applied dose [J cm ⁻²]/illumination duration [min]/start concentration [CFU ml ⁻¹]} (Reference)
	405	35.9	{16.4/ATCC 25923/15/1.5E5} (Guffey and Wilborn 2006), {60.6/MRSA US-300/60/10/5E6} ² , {58.3/MRSA IS-853/60/10/5.0E6} ² (Enwemeka et al. 2008), {7.2/ NCTC 4135/36/60/1.0E5}, {12.0/NCTC 4135/36/60/1.0E3}, {10.3/NCTC 4135/31/52/1.0E5}, {12.0/NCTC 4135/36/60/1.0E7}, {13.7/NCTC 4135/41/70/1.0E9}, {9.0/MRSA (clinical isolate 16a, GRI)/45/75/1.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2009), {13.6/NCTC 4135/72/30/5.0E4} ² (Maclean et al. 2013), {967.7/ATCC 6538/600/420/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2016), {118.1/ATCC 35932/-/540/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2015), {60.8/NCTC 4135/468/120/1.0E7} (McKenzie et al. 2016), {9.8/NCTC 4135/23.5/120/2.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2008b), {38.7/ATCC BAA-1680/60/10/3.0E6} ² , {35.9/ATCC BAA-1680/55/9/5.0E6} ² , {101.0/ATCC BAA-1680/60/10/7.0E6} ² (Bumah et al. 2015a), {41.8/ATCC BAA-1680/60/10/3.0E6}, {42.9/ATCC BAA-1680/60/10/5.0E6}, {101.7/ATCC BAA-1680/60/10/7.0E6} (Bumah et al. 2013), {10.5/NCTC 4135/18/4/1.0E3} (McDonald et al. 2013), {27.3/NCTC 4135/9/30/1.0E3} ² (Ramakrishnan et al. 2014), {100.8/ATCC BAA-1680/121/15/5.0E6} (Masson-Meyers et al. 2015)
	410	21.4	{21.4/NCTC 4135/23.5/120/2.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2008b)
	415	84.1	{47.0/NCTC 4135/23.5/120/2.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2008b), {121.2/ATCC 25923/120/20} ² (Lipovsky et al. 2010)
	420	78.3	{78.3/NCTC 4135/23.5/120/2.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2008b)
	425	929.0	{929.0/KCTC 1916/172.8/480/2.0E8} ² (Kim et al. 2013)
	430	235.0	{235.0/NCTC 4135/23.5/120/2.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2008b)
	450	390.0	{390.0/ATCC 25923/117/975/1.5E2} (Keshishyan et al. 2015)
	455	360.4	{360.4/ATCC 25923/120/20/?} ² (Lipovsky et al. 2010)
	460	-	{-/ATCC 6538/1800/420/1.0E6} ^{1,3} (Kumar et al. 2016)
	461	150.7	{150.7/ATCC BAA 679/596.7/450/1.0E6} ² (Ghate et al. 2013)
	470	58.3	{58.3/MRSA US-300/60/33/5.0E6}, {63.8/MRSA IS-853/60/33/5.0E6} (Enwemeka et al. 2009), {35.7/ATCC 25923/15/-/1.5E5} (Guffey and Wilborn 2006), {50.0/ATCC BAA-1680/55/-/5.0E6}, {107.8/ATCC BAA-1680/55/-/7.0E6} (Bumah, Masson-Meyers and Enwemeka 2015b), {40.9/ATCC BAA-1680/45/25/3.0E6} ² , {50.0/ATCC BAA-1680/60/33/5.0E6} ² , {122.2/ATCC BAA-1680/60/33/7.0E6} ² (Bumah et al. 2015a), {39.2/ATCC BAA-1680/60/-/3.0E6} ² (Bumah et al. 2015a), {58.4/ATCC BAA-1680/60/-/5.0E6} ² , {82.2/ATCC BAA-1680/60/-/7.0E6} ² , {96.5/ATCC BAA-1680/60/-/8.0E6} ² , {83.3/ATCC BAA-1680/60/-/1.2E7} ² (Bumah, Masson-Meyers and Enwemeka 2015b), {52.2/ATCC BAA-1680/60/33/5.0E6}, {27.5/ATCC BAA-1680/60/33/3.0E6}, {51.9/ATCC BAA-1680/60/33/5.0E6}, {123.5/ATCC BAA-1680/60/33/7.0E6} (Bumah et al. 2013)
	520	1478.6	{127.0/ATCC 6538/596.7/450/1.0E6} (Ghate et al. 2013), {2830.2/ATCC 35932/3000/540/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2015)
		-	{-/ATCC 6538/1800/420/1.0E6} ^{1,3} (Kumar et al. 2016)
	521	287.5	{287.5/ATCC BAA 679/431.2/450/1.0E6} (Ghate et al. 2013)
	525	424.6	{424.6/KCTC 1916/172.8/480/2.0E8} (Kim et al. 2013)
	625	-	{-/KCTC 1916/172.8/480/2.0E8} ^{1,3} (Kim et al. 2013)
	642	-	{-/ATCC BAA 679/688/450/1.0E6} (Ghate et al. 2013)
	660	34.8	{34.8/ATCC 25923/24/1.5E3} (de Sousa et al. 2016)
<i>Staphylococcus epidermis</i> (+)	405	18.9	{9.1/NCTC 11964/42/70/1.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2009), {46.3/LMG 10474/324/180/1.0E3} (Ramakrishnan et al. 2016), {14.8/LMG 10474/9/30/1.0E3} ² (Ramakrishnan et al. 2014), {23.1/NCTC 11964/18/4/1.0E3} (McDonald et al. 2013)
<i>Stenotrophomonas maltophilia</i> (-)	400	15.0	{15.0/STEMA 529/108/30/1E6}, {36.4/STEMA 551/108/30/1.0E6}, {14.7/STEMA 558/108/30/1E6} (Halstead et al. 2016)
<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i> (+)	405	10.8	{10.8/NCTC 8198/54/90/1.0E5} (Maclean et al. 2009)
<i>Vibrio parahaemolyticus</i> (-)	405	170.0	{170.0/ATCC 17802/420/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2016)
	460	717.0	{717.0/ATCC 17802/420/1.0E6} ² (Kumar et al. 2016)
	520	-	{-/ATCC 17802/420/1.0E6} ^{1,3} (Kumar et al. 2016)

¹No photoinactivation observed. ²Data from figure. ³Log reduction value from table. ⁴Anaerobic condition.




Figure 2. Wavelength-dependent necessary irradiation doses from Table 1 for one log-level reduction of Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria.

concentration and therefore interfere with the photoinactivation efficacy, especially if residual metabolic activity of bacteria is present, which is probably true in the cases in which bacteria were diluted in nutrient broth.

IMPORTANCE OF ILLUMINATION SETUP

Another potential origin of variations is the illumination homogeneity. Some authors have tried to guarantee a homogeneous sample illumination, e.g. with an LED array that offered a radiation source area as large as the sample area or even larger. In several setups, however, just a single LED was located very close to the sample. Such a point-like light source results in an inhomogeneous illumination as was illustrated in Murdoch et al. (2012) with intensity variations of one order of magnitude over the illuminated area. With this setup the disinfection success in the outer regions of the sample is strongly reduced, an effect which cannot be compensated by a higher irradiation in the middle of the sample. These setups would result in exaggerated necessary irradiation doses for a one log-level reduction.

There is a further potential error source in the illumination setups. In many studies transparent sample vessels, e.g. transparent Petri dishes were used. If these vessels are placed on a reflective metallic or white/gray base, the light is reflected after its first sample transit and it may pass the sample a second time and thereby increases the illumination intensity by almost a factor of two compared to the assumed or previously measured intensity. Thus the calculated necessary irradiation doses would be too low for a one log-level reduction. A similar problem arises when the samples are irradiated directly on an agar plate, where the agar is not black.

SUCCESSFUL PHOTOINACTIVATION OF GRAM-POSITIVE AND GRAM-NEGATIVE BACTERIA WITH 405 AND 470 nm IRRADIATION

Despite the high data variability the published studies revealed some interesting conclusions. Under aerobic conditions all bacteria – including spores – investigated so far could be photoinactivated by exposure to 405 nm radiation (Table 1 and Fig. 2). With a dose of about 500 J cm^{-2} of 405 nm radiation almost all bacterial species besides spores should be reduced by three orders of magnitude or more. A similar statement is true for 470 nm light, but in this case higher illumination doses are necessary. Even

for some longer wavelengths successful photoinactivation was reported, especially around 525 and 650 nm, but in general the necessary inactivation dose seems to rise exponentially with the wavelength.

Some authors reported Gram-negative bacteria to be more resistant to photoinactivation than Gram-positive (Maclean et al. 2009, 2013; Dai et al. 2012; Murdoch et al. 2012, 2013; Luksiene and Brovko 2013; McDonald et al. 2013; Birmpa et al. 2014; Aponiemi and Luksiene 2015; D'Souza et al. 2015) but the data compilation in Fig. 2 shows no clear evidence for this assumption. In fact some of the most sensitive bacteria listed in Table 1 such as *Acinetobacter* spp., *Campylobacter* spp. and *Pseudomonas* spp. are Gram-negative.

INVOLVEMENT OF AN UNKNOWN PHOTOSENSITIZER?

For investigating the wavelength dependence of the observed photoinactivation data and its consistency with the assumed responsible photosensitizers (coproporphyrin III, protoporphyrin IX and uroporphyrin III), a photoinactivation data subset was compiled.

The most complete data for different wavelengths exist on *Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Listeria monocytogenes* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Evaluating these data the wavelength range was divided in 20 nm intervals, beginning with 380 nm (380–399 nm, 400–419 nm, 420–439 nm, 440–459 nm, 460–479 nm, ...). For each of these bacteria and each interval the median of the existing data from Table 1 was inverted, resulting in the log reduction achieved with one joule per square centimeter. These values can be found in Table 2, together with the photoinactivation sensitivity ratio between the 410 nm interval and the 470 nm interval. The log reductions per J cm^{-2} are depicted in Fig. 4 together with the most important porphyrin absorption spectra.

The observed spectral dependence of the necessary log reduction doses for the selected bacteria in Fig. 4 in the range 400–450 nm is in excellent agreement with the assumed dominant role of porphyrins as ROS-generating photosensitizers: the photoinactivation sensitivity is high around 405 nm and declines towards 450 nm. This coincides with the porphyrin absorption spectra in Fig. 4. In contrast it does not explain the disinfection with 470 nm irradiation, because the observed photoinactivation sensitivity ratios between 405 nm and 470 nm are in a range of 2–5 (Table 2), which is much lower than the absorption ratios of the prominent porphyrins that differ by about two orders of magnitude between 405 and 470 nm (Fig. 4). So the photoinactivation sensitivity at 470 nm cannot be explained just by the previously mentioned porphyrins but may involve a further unknown endogenous photosensitizer. FAD or other flavins are potential candidates that are known for their photoinactivation properties and they show significant absorbance around 470 nm, but they usually have a peak absorption around 440 or 450 nm, which is in contrast to the observed minimum of photoinactivation sensitivity at 450 nm in Fig. 4.

CONCLUSION

Comparing the studies on photoinactivation by visible light published so far some general conclusions can be drawn. The data evaluation showed that considering aerobic conditions every bacterial species investigated so far can generally be photoinactivated by 405 nm and 470 nm irradiation. The necessary irradiation dose is significantly higher for 470 nm illumination.





Figure 3. (a) Calculated necessary 405 nm illumination doses for a one log-level bacterial concentration reduction for *E. coli* and *S. aureus* for different illumination durations. (b) Calculated necessary 405 nm illumination doses for a one log-level bacteria concentration reduction for *E. coli* and *S. aureus* for different applied irradiation doses. (c) Calculated necessary 405 nm illumination doses for a one log-level bacteria concentration reduction for *E. coli* and *S. aureus* for different bacterial starting concentrations. (Two extreme outliers, determined under particular undefined illumination conditions, were omitted.)

Table 2. Log reductions achieved with 1 J cm^{-2} for *E. coli*, *S. aureus*, *L. monocytogenes* and *P. aeruginosa* for different wavelengths together with the sensitivity ratio between 410 and 470 nm.

Wavelength [nm]	<i>E. coli</i> log reduction per joule [$\text{cm}^2 \text{J}^{-1}$]	<i>L. monocytogenes</i> log reduction per joule [$\text{cm}^2 \text{J}^{-1}$]	<i>P. aeruginosa</i> log reduction per joule [$\text{cm}^2 \text{J}^{-1}$]	<i>S. aureus</i> log reduction per joule [$\text{cm}^2 \text{J}^{-1}$]
390	$2.3\text{E}-02$	–	–	–
410	$1.4\text{E}-02$	$1.2\text{E}-02$	$6.0\text{E}-02$	$4.1\text{E}-02$
430	$1.3\text{E}-02$	$1.8\text{E}-03$	–	$8.3\text{E}-03$
450	$4.6\text{E}-03$	$4.8\text{E}-04$	$7.0\text{E}-03$	$2.0\text{E}-03$
470	$3.2\text{E}-03$	$3.8\text{E}-03$	$1.4\text{E}-02$	$1.7\text{E}-02$
530	$3.2\text{E}-04$	$6.5\text{E}-04$	–	$2.8\text{E}-03$
630	$3.1\text{E}-08$	–	–	–
670	$5.9\text{E}-07$	–	$1.5\text{E}-02$	$2.9\text{E}-02$
750	$7.7\text{E}-08$	–	–	–
Ratio @405 nm/@470 nm	4.4	3.1	4.2	2.4

**Figure 4.** Spectral data of log reduction per joule for *E. coli*, *S. aureus*, *L. monocytogenes* and *P. aeruginosa* and relative absorption spectra of coproporphyrin III, protoporphyrin IX and uroporphyrin III.

Successful photoinactivation has also been reported for longer wavelengths but few data exist and some negative results have then been observed. Differences between different strains of a bacterial species, e.g. strains that are resistant or sensitive to antibiotics, have not been recognized so far, nor are there general differences between Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria.

Nevertheless a high data variability was observed in the different publications. The variations in calculated necessary doses for a one log-level reduction most probably originate in experimental setups. The illumination duration for achieving a certain dose does not seem to be an important factor in the analyzed studies, but the illumination homogeneity of some setups is unclear as is the question of whether reflections were always considered. The oxygen concentration within bacterial suspensions is largely unknown but may represent an important influence on photoinactivation results. We therefore recommend a homogeneous illumination without unintended reflections in future setups. Bacterial concentrations should preferably be kept low ($\leq 10^6 \text{ CFU ml}^{-1}$) and as a precaution the dissolved oxygen concentration should be measured at the beginning and the end of the experiments.

Overall photoinactivation with visible light by endogenous photosensitizers has a high potential for many future applications and should be further investigated.

Conflict of interest

K. Hoenes and M. Hessling filed a German patent application on contact lens disinfection by photoinactivation in 2015. B. Spellerberg declares no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Amin RM, Bhayana B, Hamblin MR *et al.* Antimicrobial blue light inactivation of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* by photo-excitation of endogenous porphyrins: In vitro and in vivo studies. *Lasers Surg Med* 2016;**48**:562–8.
- Aponiene K, Luksiene Z. Effective combination of LED-based visible light, photosensitizer and photocatalyst to combat Gram (–) bacteria. *J Photochem Photobiol B* 2015;**142**:257–63.
- Ashkenazi H, Malik Z, Harth Y *et al.* Eradication of *Propionibacterium acnes* by its endogenic porphyrins after illumination

- with high intensity blue light. *FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol* 2003;**35**:17–24.
- Birmpa A, Vantarakis A, Paparrodopoulos S et al. Efficacy of three light technologies for reducing microbial populations in liquid suspensions. *Biomed Res Int* 2014;**2014**:673939.
- Bumah VV, Masson-Meyers DS, Cashin S et al. Optimization of the antimicrobial effect of blue light on methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in vitro. *Lasers Surg Med* 2015a;**47**:266–72.
- Bumah VV, Masson-Meyers DS, Cashin SE et al. Wavelength and bacterial density influence the bactericidal effect of blue light on methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA). *Photomed Laser Surg* 2013;**31**:547–53.
- Bumah VV, Masson-Meyers DS, Enwemeka CS. (July 14, 2015) Blue 470 nm light suppresses the growth of *Salmonella enterica* and methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in vitro. *Lasers Surg Med* 2015b, DOI: 10.1002/lsm.22385.
- Chevrefils G, Caron É. UV dose required to achieve incremental log inactivation of bacteria, protozoa and viruses. *IUVA News* 2006;**8**:38–45.
- Cieplik F, Späth A, Leibl C et al. Blue light kills *Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans* due to its endogenous photosensitizers. *Clin Oral Investig* 2014;**18**:1763–9.
- Dai T, Gupta A, Huang Y-Y et al. Blue light rescues mice from potentially fatal *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* burn infection: efficacy, safety, and mechanism of action. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2013;**57**:1238–45.
- Dai T, Gupta A, Murray CK et al. Blue light for infectious diseases: *Propionibacterium acnes*, *Helicobacter pylori*, and beyond? *Drug Resist Updat* 2012;**15**:223–36.
- De Lucca AJ, Carter-Wientjes C, Williams KA et al. Blue light (470 nm) effectively inhibits bacterial and fungal growth. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 2012;**55**:460–6.
- de Sousa NTA, Gomes RC, Santos MF et al. Red and infrared laser therapy inhibits in vitro growth of major bacterial species that commonly colonize skin ulcers. *Lasers Med Sci* 2016;**31**:549–56.
- DIN EN 14897. Water conditioning equipment inside buildings – Devices using mercury low-pressure ultraviolet radiators – Requirements for performance, safety and testing. (In German). *DIN Standard*. DIN EN 14897:2007-09, 2007.
- Downes A, Blunt TP. Researches on the effect of light upon bacteria and other organisms. *Proc R Soc Lond* 1877;**26**:488–500.
- Downes A, Blunt TP. On the influence of light upon protoplasm. *Proc R Soc Lond* 1878;**28**:199–212.
- D'Souza C, Yuk H-G, Khoo GH et al. Application of light-emitting diodes in food production, postharvest preservation, and microbiological food safety. *Comp Rev Food Sci Food Safety* 2015;**14**:719–40.
- Elman M, Slatkine M, Harth Y. The effective treatment of acne vulgaris by a high-intensity, narrow band 405–420 nm light source. *J Cosmet Laser Ther* 2003;**5**:111–7.
- Endarko E, Maclean M, Timoshkin IV et al. High-intensity 405 nm light inactivation of *Listeria monocytogenes*. *Photochem Photobiol* 2012;**88**:1280–6.
- Enwemeka CS, Williams D, Enwemeka SK et al. Blue 470-nm light kills methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in vitro. *Photomed Laser Surg* 2009;**27**:221–6.
- Enwemeka CS, Williams D, Hollosi S et al. Visible 405 nm SLD light photo-destroys methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in vitro. *Lasers Surg Med* 2008;**40**:734–7.
- Feuerstein O, Ginsburg I, Dayan E et al. Mechanism of visible light phototoxicity on *Porphyromonas gingivalis* and *Fusobacterium nucleatum*. *Photochem Photobiol* 2005;**81**:1186–9.
- Feuerstein O, Persman N, Weiss EI. Phototoxic effect of visible light on *Porphyromonas gingivalis* and *Fusobacterium nucleatum*: an in vitro study. *Photochem Photobiol* 2004;**80**:412–5.
- Fontana CR, Song X, Polymeri A et al. The effect of blue light on periodontal biofilm growth in vitro. *Lasers Med Sci* 2015;**30**:2077–86.
- Frankland PF, Ward HM. Third Report to the Royal Society Water Research Committee. *Proc R Soc Lond*, 1894;**56**:315–556. Available online at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/115616>.
- Ganz RA, Viveiros J, Ahmad A et al. *Helicobacter pylori* in patients can be killed by visible light. *Lasers Surg Med* 2005;**36**:260–5.
- Geisler T. Zur Frage über die Wirkung des Lichtes auf Bakterien. *Zentralblatt für Bakteriologie und Parasitenkunde* 1890;**11**:161–73.
- Ghate V, Kumar A, Zhou W et al. Effect of organic acids on the photodynamic inactivation of selected foodborne pathogens using 461 nm LEDs. *Food Control* 2015a;**57**:333–40.
- Ghate V, Leong AL, Kumar A et al. Enhancing the antibacterial effect of 461 and 521 nm light emitting diodes on selected foodborne pathogens in trypticase soy broth by acidic and alkaline pH conditions. *Food Microbiol* 2015b;**48**:49–57.
- Ghate VS, Ng KS, Zhou W et al. Antibacterial effect of light emitting diodes of visible wavelengths on selected foodborne pathogens at different illumination temperatures. *Int J Food Microbiol* 2013;**166**:399–406.
- Guffey JS, Payne W, James L. Inactivation of *Mycobacterium smegmatis* following exposure to 405-nanometer light from a supraluminous diode array. *Wounds* 2013;**25**:131–5.
- Guffey JS, Wilborn J. In vitro bactericidal effects of 405-nm and 470-nm blue light. *Photomed Laser Surg* 2006;**24**:684–8.
- Halstead FD, Thwaite JE, Burt R et al. Antibacterial activity of blue light against nosocomial wound pathogens growing planktonically and as mature biofilms. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2016;**82**:4006–16.
- Hamblin MR, Viveiros J, Yang C et al. *Helicobacter pylori* accumulates photoactive porphyrins and is killed by visible light. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2005;**49**:2822–7.
- Haughton PN, Grau EG, Lyng J et al. Susceptibility of *Campylobacter* to high intensity near ultraviolet/visible 395 ± 5 nm light and its effectiveness for the decontamination of raw chicken and contact surfaces. *Int J Food Microbiol* 2012;**159**:267–73.
- Hoenes K, Stangl F, Gross A et al. Improved contact lens disinfection by exposure to violet radiation. *Technol Health Care* 2016;**24**:145–51.
- Hoenes K, Stangl F, Sift M et al. Visible optical radiation generates bactericidal effect applicable for inactivation of health care associated germs demonstrated by inactivation of *E. coli* and *B. subtilis* using 405-nm and 460-nm light emitting diodes. In Arjen A, Vitkin IA (eds). *European Conferences on Biomedical Optics*, Sunday 21 June 2015, Munich, Germany, p. 95400T. SPIE Proceedings, 2015. DOI:10.1117/12.2183903.
- Hoenes K, Vogelaar D, Hessling M. Future contact lens disinfection with violet LEDs. In *Proceedings Biomedica Summit, Aachen, Germany*, 2016. M19, pp. 1–4, 2016. Available online at <http://www.biomedicasummit.com/>.
- Hope CK, Hindley JA, Khan Z et al. Lethal photosensitization of *Porphyromonas gingivalis* by their endogenous porphyrins under anaerobic conditions: an in vitro study. *Photodiagnosis Photodyn Ther* 2013;**10**:677–82.
- Kawada A, Aragane Y, Kameyama H et al. Acne phototherapy with a high-intensity, enhanced, narrow-band, blue light source: an open study and in vitro investigation. *J Dermatol Sci* 2002;**30**:129–35.

- Keshishyan ES, Zaporozhtseva ZV, Zenina OM et al. Photodynamic inactivation of bacteria in vitro under the effect of blue light. *Bull Exp Biol Med* 2015;**158**:475–7.
- Kim SW, Kim J, Lim WB et al. In vitro bactericidal effects of 625, 525, and 425 nm wavelength (red, green, and blue) light-emitting diode irradiation. *Photomed Laser Surg* 2013;**31**:554–62.
- Kleinpenning MM, Smits T, Frunt MHA et al. Clinical and histological effects of blue light on normal skin. *Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed* 2010;**26**:16–21.
- Kumar A, Ghate V, Kim M-J et al. Kinetics of bacterial inactivation by 405 nm and 520 nm light emitting diodes and the role of endogenous coproporphyrin on bacterial susceptibility. *J Photochem Photobiol B* 2015;**149**:37–44.
- Kumar A, Ghate V, Kim MJ et al. Antibacterial efficacy of 405, 460 and 520 nm light emitting diodes on *Lactobacillus plantarum*, *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Vibrio parahaemolyticus*. *J Appl Microbiol* 2016;**120**:49–56.
- Lembo AJ, Ganz RA, Sheth S et al. Treatment of *Helicobacter pylori* infection with intra-gastric violet light phototherapy: a pilot clinical trial. *Lasers Surg Med* 2009;**41**:337–44.
- Lipovsky A, Nitzan Y, Gedanken A et al. Visible light-induced killing of bacteria as a function of wavelength: implication for wound healing. *Lasers Surg Med* 2010;**42**:467–72.
- Lui GY, Roser D, Corkish R et al. Point-of-use water disinfection using ultraviolet and visible light-emitting diodes. *Sci Total Environ* 2016;**553**:626–35.
- Luksiene Z, Brovko L. Antibacterial photosensitization-based treatment for food safety. *Food Eng Rev* 2013;**5**:185–99.
- McDonald RS, Gupta S, Maclean M et al. 405 nm light exposure of osteoblasts and inactivation of bacterial isolates from arthroplasty patients: potential for new disinfection applications? *Eur Cell Mater* 2013;**25**:204–14.
- McKenzie K, Maclean M, Grant MH et al. The effects of 405 nm light on bacterial membrane integrity determined by salt and bile tolerance assays, leakage of UV absorbing material and SYTOX green labelling. *Microbiology* 2016;**162**:1680–8.
- McKenzie K, Maclean M, Timoshkin IV et al. Enhanced inactivation of *Escherichia coli* and *Listeria monocytogenes* by exposure to 405 nm light under sub-lethal temperature, salt and acid stress conditions. *Int J Food Microbiol* 2014;**170**:91–8.
- Maclean M, MacGregor SJ, Anderson JG et al. The role of oxygen in the visible-light inactivation of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *J Photochem Photobiol B* 2008a;**92**:180–4.
- Maclean M, MacGregor SJ, Anderson JG et al. High-intensity narrow-spectrum light inactivation and wavelength sensitivity of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 2008b;**285**:227–32.
- Maclean M, MacGregor SJ, Anderson JG et al. Inactivation of bacterial pathogens following exposure to light from a 405-nanometer light-emitting diode array. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2009;**75**:1932–7.
- Maclean M, McKenzie K, Anderson JG et al. 405 nm light technology for the inactivation of pathogens and its potential role for environmental disinfection and infection control. *J Hosp Infect* 2014;**88**:1–11.
- Maclean M, Murdoch LE, MacGregor SJ et al. Sporicidal effects of high-intensity 405 nm visible light on endospore-forming bacteria. *Photochem Photobiol* 2013;**89**:120–6.
- Masson-Meyers DS, Bumah VV, Biener G et al. The relative antimicrobial effect of blue 405 nm LED and blue 405 nm laser on methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in vitro. *Lasers Med Sci* 2015;**30**:2265–71.
- Moorhead S, Maclean M, Coia JE et al. Synergistic efficacy of 405 nm light and chlorinated disinfectants for the enhanced decontamination of *Clostridium difficile* spores. *Anaerobe* 2016;**37**:72–7.
- Motts SD, Guffey JS, Payne WC et al. The use of 405nm and 464nm blue light to inhibit *Listeria monocytogenes* in ready-to-eat (RTE) meat. *European Journal of Academic Essays* 2016;**3**:76–80.
- Murdoch LE, McKenzie K, Maclean M et al. Lethal effects of high-intensity violet 405-nm light on *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, *Candida albicans*, and on dormant and germinating spores of *Aspergillus niger*. *Fungal Biol* 2013;**117**:519–27.
- Murdoch LE, Maclean M, Endarko E et al. Bactericidal effects of 405 nm light exposure demonstrated by inactivation of *Escherichia*, *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Listeria*, and *Mycobacterium* species in liquid suspensions and on exposed surfaces. *ScientificWorldJournal* 2012;**2012**:137805.
- Murdoch LE, Maclean M, MacGregor SJ et al. Inactivation of *Campylobacter jejuni* by exposure to high-intensity 405-nm visible light. *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 2010;**7**:1211–6.
- Papageorgiou P, Katsambas A, Chu A. Phototherapy with blue (415 nm) and red (660 nm) light in the treatment of acne vulgaris. *Br J Dermatol* 2000;**142**:973–8.
- Ramakrishnan P, Maclean M, MacGregor SJ et al. Differential sensitivity of osteoblasts and bacterial pathogens to 405-nm light highlighting potential for decontamination applications in orthopedic surgery. *J Biomed Opt* 2014;**19**:105001.
- Ramakrishnan P, Maclean M, MacGregor SJ et al. Cytotoxic responses to 405nm light exposure in mammalian and bacterial cells: Involvement of reactive oxygen species. *Toxicol In Vitro* 2016;**33**:54–62.
- Rhodes NLR, de la Presa M, Barneck MD et al. Violet 405 nm light: A novel therapeutic agent against β -lactam-resistant *Escherichia coli*. *Lasers Surg Med* 2016;**48**:311–7.
- Riedel TE, Berelson WM, Neelson KH et al. Oxygen consumption rates of bacteria under nutrient-limited conditions. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2013;**79**:4921–31.
- Srimagal A, Ramesh T, Sahu JK. Effect of light emitting diode treatment on inactivation of *Escherichia coli* in milk. *LWT-Food Sci Technol* 2016;**71**:378–85.
- Ward HM. The action of light on bacteria. III. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 1894;**185**:961–86.
- Zhang Y, Zhu Y, Gupta A et al. Antimicrobial blue light therapy for multidrug-resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii* infection in a mouse burn model: implications for prophylaxis and treatment of combat-related wound infections. *J Infect Dis* 2014;**209**:1963–71.