Sanitizing food contact surfaces by the use of essential oils

I. Falcó^{1,2}, M. Verdeguer³, R. Aznar^{1,2}, G. Sánchez^{1,2}, W. Randazzo^{1,2 *}

¹*Department of Preservation and Food Safety Technologies, (IATA-CSIC). Av. Agustín Escardino 7. 46980 Paterna. Valencia, Spain;*

²*Departament of Microbiology and Ecology, University of Valencia. Av. Dr. Moliner, 50. 46100 Burjassot. Valencia. Spain;*

³*Instituto Agroforestal Mediterráneo, Universitat Politècnica de València, Camino de Vera, s/n 46022, Valencia, Spain.*

*Corresponding author: Walter Randazzo.

Carrer del Catedràtic Agustín Escardino Benlloch, 7, 46980 Paterna, Valencia. Spain.

Tel.: + 34 96 3900022; Fax: + 34 96 3939301; E-mail: walran@uv.es

18 **ABSTRACT**

19 Chemical sanitizers continue to be widely used by the food industry to disinfect food contact
20 surfaces. However, as some chemical disinfectants have been reported to produce unhealthy by-
21 products, alternative and natural compounds need to be investigated. To this end, nine essential oils
22 (EOs) were screened to develop a natural sanitizing solution (SAN) for disinfecting food contact
23 surfaces. Once extracted, their antimicrobial activity and chemical composition were determined.
24 An exploratory multivariate approach was used to investigate the relationships between the
25 chemical and microbiological data sets. Among the tested EOs, *Thymbra capitata* EO, containing
26 up to 93.31% oxygenated monoterpenes (mainly carvacrol), showed the strongest antimicrobial
27 activity and thus was assayed as a potential SAN for food contact surfaces. To this end, a SAN
28 consisting of 1% *T. capitata* EO was first validated according to the AOAC standard, which showed
29 about an 8 log reduction for *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella enterica* after 30 and 60 seconds of
30 contact time, respectively. Then, the SAN was evaluated at various concentrations, cleanliness
31 conditions, and contact times on stainless steel, glass, and polypropylene surfaces for sanitizing
32 purposes. The results showed that the SAN containing 2.5% of *T. capitata* EO applied for 10 min,
33 reduced the levels of *E. coli* by more than 3 log and *S. enterica* by 1 log under clean working
34 conditions on the three tested surfaces. These findings indicate that EOs can be used as natural
35 disinfectants to decontaminate food contact surfaces, thus lowering the risk of the indirect transfer
36 of bacterial pathogens to food or persons.

37

38

39 **Keywords:** Essential oils; Natural sanitizers; Foodborne pathogens; Food contact surfaces; Food
40 safety.

41

42 **1. Introduction**

43 Microbial safety of food products is a key concern of consumers, the food industry, and regulatory
44 bodies. Thus, different guidelines have been proposed to limit and control the occurrence of
45 pathogens in food products (Codex alimentarius, 2007), and they agree that these risks can be
46 reduced through safe food preparation, consumption, and storage practices by increasing hygienic
47 measures along the entire food chain. On top of that, diarrheal diseases caused by bacteria are one
48 of the most common illnesses resulting from the consumption of contaminated food (World Health
49 Organization, 2014).

50 In the European Union, *Salmonella* and Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* have been
51 identified as the first and seventh most common causes of foodborne illness outbreaks, respectively
52 (EFSA, 2016). Moreover, *Salmonella* and *E. coli* are considered safety/hygiene indicators because
53 their presence in food and water is due to fecal contamination and/or inadequate hygiene practices
54 (Ceuppens et al., 2015).

55 The role that contaminated surfaces play in spreading pathogenic bacteria such as *Salmonella* and
56 *E. coli* to foods is already well established in food processing, catering, and domestic environments
57 such as chopping boards, knives, processing machines, tanks, and vats that can act as reservoirs
58 and/or vehicles of pathogens. Food contact surfaces and equipment are commonly made by
59 different materials such as stainless steel, and polypropylene glass that can divergently play in
60 harboring pathogens (Chia, Goulter, McMeekin, Dykes, & Fegan, 2009; Duffy, O'Callaghan,
61 McAuley, Fegan, & Craven, 2009).

62 In the food industry, to reduce the spread of bacteria through contaminated surfaces, chemicals are
63 routinely used to sanitize and disinfect food contact surfaces (Phillips, 2016; Simões, Simões, &
64 Vieira, 2010). However, some of these chemicals (e.g. chlorine compounds, peroxide and
65 peroxyacid mixtures, carboxylic acids, quaternary ammonium compounds, acid anionic, and iodine
66 compounds) may generate the formation of by-products (e.g. trihalomethanes, haloacetic acids, and
67 other potentially carcinogenic compounds), or contribute to the development of antibiotic resistance

in bacteria (e.g. triclosan) (Coroneo et al., 2017; Davidson & Harrison, 2002; Doyle, 2006; Halden, 2014; Marques et al., 2007; Xue et al., 2017). Alternative antimicrobial compounds would, therefore, be beneficial, especially for the development of natural sanitizers. In recent years, because of increased consumer awareness and concern regarding synthetic chemical additives or sanitizers, foods and food-contact surfaces treated with EOs or their main active compounds have become very popular since they are safer for humans and environmentally-friendly (S. Burt, 2004). Moreover, many of them show antimicrobial, antifungal, and virucidal properties, and thus represent potential ‘natural’ alternatives to chemical preservatives in the food industry (S. Burt, 2004; da Cruz Cabral, Fernández Pinto, & Patriarca, 2013; Sánchez & Aznar, 2015).

The selection and standardization of EOs is a critical task because many factors (e.g. plant material, ecological conditions, and extraction method) affect their chemical composition and, consequently, their biological and antimicrobial properties (S. Burt, 2004; Settanni et al., 2014).

Some EOs such as *Citrus* spp. (Fisher & Phillips, 2008), cinnamon (Van Haute, Raes, Devlieghere, & Sampers, 2017), oregano, and thyme (Yemiş & Candoğan, 2017) have been used as natural antimicrobials in food application, while uncommon, plant-derived EOs have received limited attention. So far, some well characterized EOs or their main active compounds have been directly applied as flavoring agents in food, used in washing solutions for vegetables, or incorporated in packaging materials to control foodborne pathogens (Irkin & Esmer, 2015). Furthermore, the application of well-characterized EOs to sanitize food contact surfaces has also been investigated (Giaouris et al., 2014; Rhoades et al., 2013; Valeriano et al., 2012)

Thus, this study aims to (i) collect, extract, and chemically characterize EOs from little-known plants; (ii) screen their antimicrobial activity against the common foodborne pathogens *S. enterica* and *E. coli*; and (iii) develop a natural EO-based sanitizer and evaluate its antibacterial activity on stainless steel, glass, and polypropylene surfaces.

92

93 2. Materials and methods

94 2.1. Plant material and extraction of EOs and aqueous extracts

95 Aerial parts (leaves and/or sprigs) from *Eriocephalus africanus* L. (EO1), *Artemisia absinthium* L.
96 (EO2), *Santolina chamaecyparissus* L. (EO3), *Mentha longifolia* (L.) L. (EO4), *Thymbra capitata*
97 (L.) Cav. (EO6), *Citrus limon* (L.) Osbeck (EO7), *Citrus reticulata* Blanco (EO8) and *Eucalyptus*
98 *camaldulensis* Dehnh (EO9) were collected in different areas of Spain to obtain their EOs (Table
99 1S). *Pelargonium odoratissimum* (L.) L'Hér. EO (EO5) was purchased from Titolchimica (Italy).
100 After collection, fresh plant material was immediately subjected to hydro-distillation for 3 h using a
101 Clevenger-type apparatus, collecting the oil in hexane. In particular, about 500 g of plant material
102 was weighted and transferred to 4 l Clevenger flasks with 2 l of distilled water. The steam and oil
103 vapour were condensed and the oil was separated from the water using Florentine flasks. EOs were
104 dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate to remove residual water traces and finally the extraction yield
105 calculated (Table 1S). EOs were stored at 4°C in air-tight sealed glass vials covered with aluminum
106 foil until use.

107 2.2. Chemical characterization of EOs

108 The quantification of the samples was performed by gas chromatography (GC) using a Clarus
109 500GC Perkin–Elmer apparatus equipped with a flame ionization detector (FID), and capillary
110 column ZB-5 (30 m × 0.25 mm i.d. × 0.25 µm film thickness). The injection volume was 1 µl. The
111 GC oven temperature was set at 60°C for 5 min, with 3°C increases per min to 180°C, then 20°C
112 increases per min to 280°C which was maintained for 10 min. Helium was the carrier gas (1.2
113 ml/min). Injector and detector temperatures were set at 250°C. The percentage composition of the
114 EO was computed from GC peak areas without correction factors by means of the software Total
115 Chrom 6.2 (Perkin-Elmer Inc., Wellesley, PA, USA).

116 For the identification of the compounds, gas chromatography coupled to mass spectrometry (GC-
117 MS) was used (Adams, 2007) using a Clarus 500 GC-MS from Perkin-Elmer Inc., equipped with
118 the same column, carrier and operating conditions as described above for GC analysis. Ionization
119 source temperature was set at 200°C and 70 eV electron impact mode was employed. MS spectra

were obtained by means of total ion scan (TIC) mode (mass range m/z 45-500 uma). The total ion chromatograms and mass spectra were processed with the Turbomass 5.4 software (Perkin-Elmer Inc.). Retention indexes were determined by injection of C8–C25 n-alkanes standard (Supelco) under the same conditions. The EO components were identified by comparison of their mass spectra with those of computer library NIST MS Search 2.0 and available data in the literature. Identification of the following compounds was confirmed by comparison of their experimental RI with those of authentic reference standards (Sigma-Aldrich): α -pinene, β -pinene, camphene, myrcene, limonene, camphor, terpinolene, β -thujone, borneol, terpinen-4-ol, bornyl acetate, geraniol and linalool.

2.3. Screening for antimicrobial activity and minimum inhibitory concentration determination

The reference strains *E. coli* O157:H7 CECT 5947 (non-toxigenic) and *S. enterica subsp. enterica* CECT 4138 supplied by the Spanish Type Culture Collection (CECT) were used to test the antibacterial activity of nine EOs. Firstly, paper disc diffusion assay (PDDA) was used as rapid screening method (Balouiri, Sadiki, & Ibnsouda, 2016; Settanni et al., 2014). Briefly, bacterial cells were grown overnight at 37°C on tryptic soy broth (TSB), the concentration adjusted to 7 log CFU/ml and seed on tryptic soy agar (TSA) using a cotton swab. Once dried, sterile paper discs (Sigma-Aldrich) were placed on the plate surface. Each disk was soaked with 10 μ l of each undiluted EO. Sterile water and streptomycin (10%, w/v) were used as negative and positive control, respectively. Each test was performed in duplicate and the experiments were repeated twice. Additionally, the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) was determined. For that, bacterial cultures of ca. 6 log CFU/ml were exposed to increasing EO concentrations (0, 0.025, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5 and 1%) and incubated overnight at 37°C. Growth inhibition was evaluated after 4 and 24h of incubation by plate count on TSA.

2.4. Evaluation of the EO-based sanitizer following AOAC 960.09 and EN 13697:2015 standards

Based on preliminary antimicrobial assays (PDDA and MIC), a sanitizer solution (SAN) was prepared using EO6 and ethanol mixed in a ratio 1:1. SAN was freshly prepared before each assay.

Initially, the SAN was evaluated following the AOAC 960.09 standard method “Germicidal and detergent sanitizing action of disinfectants”. Briefly, 9.90 ml solution of 2 % SAN prepared in synthetic hard water of 400 ppm CaCO₃ (AOAC 960.09) was inoculated with 0.1 ml of bacterial inoculum, resulting in a final concentration of ca. 8 log CFU/ml, and incubated for 30 and 60 seconds at room temperature (RT). Then, serial dilutions were performed using peptone water (PW) as neutralizer (previously validated according to the method) and colony forming units (CFU) enumerated on TSA after 24 h at 37°C.

2.5. Surface disinfection tests

Surface disinfection tests were performed using the EN 13697:2015 standard “Chemical disinfectants and antiseptics. Quantitative non-porous surface test for the evaluation of bactericidal and/or fungicidal activity of chemical disinfectants used in food, industrial, domestic and institutional areas. Test method and requirements without mechanical action”. The bactericidal activity of SAN was evaluated on stainless steel, glass and polypropylene discs. Discs (2 x 2 cm) were sterilized with 70% (V/V) of isopropanol for 15 min before each assay. Briefly, *E. coli* and *S. enterica* suspensions were diluted (ratio 1:1) with 0.3 and 3 g/l bovine serum albumin (BSA) to mimic clean and dirty working conditions (as in EN 13697:2015). Then 50 µl of resulting inocula (ca. 6 log CFU/ml) were spotted into sterile discs and dried at RT for 15 min. Afterward, 100 µl of 0.5, 1 and 5% SAN prepared on hard water as diluent according to EN 13697:2015, were spotted on the inoculated discs, followed by incubation at RT for 1, 5 and 10 min. Then, the effect of the SAN was stopped by transferring the discs into a flask with 10 ml of peptone water as neutralizer and 5 g of glass beads. After 1 min in a shaker at 240 rpm (VWR, The Netherlands), bacterial cells were enumerated as described above. Positive controls were performed using discs treated with hard water contained the same ethanol concentration as applied for SAN.

2.6. Statistical and explorative multivariate analyses

Data obtained from chemical characterization and antimicrobial activities of EOs were analyzed using an explorative multivariate analysis, including a hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA) and a

principal component analysis (PCA). Firstly, HCA was carried out for grouping EOs samples measured by Euclidean distances; whereas cluster aggregation was based on the single linkage method (Todeschini, 1998). The input matrix used for HCA consisted of chemical compounds and MIC for both *E. coli* and *S. enterica*. The PCA explored the input matrix based on the 9 EOs introduced as cases and the normalized average data of 178 chemical compounds grouped according to their chemical classes and MIC for both *E. coli* and *S. enterica* considered as explanatory variables, preliminary evaluated by using the Barlett's sphericity test (Alfonzo et al., 2017; Bautista Gallego et al., 2011). Eigenvalues were calculated and score and loading plots including both EOs samples and GC-MS constituents were generated (Torregiani et al., 2017). The analysis of variance (ANOVA), followed by a pairwise comparison with the post-hoc Tukey's test, was applied to identify significant differences for SAN efficacies (Figures 3 and 4) with a statistical significance attributed to *p* values <0.05. All statistical data processing and graphic constructions were performed using STATISTICA software version 7 (StatSoft Inc., Tulsa, OK, USA).

185

186 **3. Results and discussion**

187 *3.1. Extraction and GC/GC-MS characterization of EOs*

The EOs' extraction yields are reported in Table 1S and ranged between 0.22 for EO2 and 3.00% (v/w) for EO6. Similar extraction yields have already been reported for *E. africanus* (0.43% v/w), *E. camaldulensis* (0.71% v/w) and *T. capitata* (2.1-5.6% v/w) (Bounatirou et al., 2007; Verdeguer, Blázquez, & Boira, 2009). The main chemical compounds constituting more than 10% of the total composition determined by GC/GC-MS for each of the nine EOs are reported in Table 1 whereas the complete composition is reported in Table 2S. A high percentage of compounds were identified for all EOs (92.69 - 99.20%), and they are grouped into different chemical classes as monoterpene hydrocarbons (MH, ranging from 2.05 to 64.47%), oxygenated monoterpenes (OM, from 28.82 to 93.3%), sesquiterpene hydrocarbons (SH, from 0 to 5.05%), oxygenated sesquiterpenes (OS, from 0 to 21.82%) and esters (EST, from 0 to 0.83%).

EO1 was mainly characterized by artemisia ketone (57.54%) among MH and intermedeol (10.54%) among OS. For EO2, the OM epoxy-ocimene <(E)-> (34.01%) and cis-chrysanthenyl acetate (28.35%) were the most abundant among a total of 28 compounds. The OM camphor (31.43%), 1,8-cineole (11.74%), terpinen-4-ol (8.64%), and the OS β -copaen-4- α -ol (10.11%) were the main compounds in EO3. EO4 was mainly characterized by the OM α -terpineol acetate (32.59%), pulegone (14.15%), carvone acetate (10.29%), and isomenthone (9.16%). Citronellol (20.40%), α -terpineol (12.60%) and geraniol (12.30%) were the main compounds of the EO5. EO6 showed 23 different compounds (99.31%), with a slight amount of MH (3.51%) and a high percentage of OM (93.06%). Among OM, it is worth noting that carvacrol contributed to a significant percentage of the EO composition (91.56%), while only 0.03% of thymol was detected. This high carvacrol level distinguishes this species from others of the *Thymus* genre (e.g. *Thymus vulgaris*), which are characterized by high levels of thymol, another OM showing antimicrobial activity (S. Burt, 2004). EO7 showed limonene (30.14%) and β -pinene (17.28%), both MHs, together with geranial (11.91%), an OM, as its main compounds. EO8 was characterized by sabinene (34.41%) and linalool (21.27%). EO9 exhibited a total of 40 compounds; p-cymene (28.34%), cryptone (14.12%), and spathulenol (17.99%) were the most abundant.

Comparing the EOs' chemical compositions, the types of compounds and their concentrations showed wide variability due to the botanical diversity of the plant material used for EO extraction. Thus, plant material deeply influences the final EO constituents, their relative concentrations (S. Burt, 2004; Chang, Chen, & Chang, 2001), and, finally, the EO antibacterial activities.

3.2. Antimicrobial activity of EOs

The antimicrobial activity of the nine EOs against *E. coli* and *S. enterica* is shown in Table 2. Both PDDA, and MIC determinations identified EO6 as the most effective; it had the widest inhibitory haloes (2.75 and 2.47 cm for *E. coli* and *S. enterica*, respectively) and inhibited the growth of both tested strains at the lowest concentration (MIC of 0.05% v/v). Considering its chemical

composition, it could be inferred that carvacrol (comprising 91.56% of the 99.31% identified compounds) was directly responsible for the antimicrobial effect. This finding is not surprising since the antimicrobial activity of carvacrol has already been reported against several foodborne pathogens (Friedman, 2014; Nostro & Papalia, 2012), and resistant isolates (Memar, Raei, Alizadeh, Aghdam, & Kafil, 2017). In addition, similar MIC values (0.025-0.03%) have been reported for pure carvacrol against *S. Typhimurium* (Kamlesh et al., 2013) and *S. enterica* (Engel, Heckler, Tondo, Daroit, & da Silva Malheiros, 2017).

In line with these results, the poor antibacterial activity of *E. africanus* (EO1), *A. absinthium* (EO2), and *M. longifolia* (EO4) have already been reported (Anwar, Alkharfy, Najeeb-ur-Rehman, Adam, & Gilani, 2017; Mkaddem et al., 2009; Riahi et al., 2015; Salie, Eagles, & Leng, 1996). EO3, extracted from *S. chamaecyparissus*, showed an MIC of 0.5%, a higher value with respect to the 0.0001% v/w reported for *E. coli* by Bel Hadj Salah-Fatnassi et al. (2017). In contrast, EO5, extracted from *P. Odoratissimum*, showed MIC values of 1% for both strains, indicating only moderate activity, while poor antimicrobial activity has been previously reported (Andrade, Cardoso, Batista, Freire, & Nelson, 2011; Lis-Balchin & Roth, 2000).

Compared to previous research, poor antibacterial activity ($MIC \geq 0.5\%$ v/v) was found for *Citrus* EOs (EO7 and EO8) (Fisher & Phillips, 2008; Randazzo, Jiménez-Belenguer, et al., 2016; Settanni et al., 2014). These discrepancies can be explained by several factors, such as intrinsic factors of the plants (e.g. genotype and, part of the plant harvested, such as leaves vs peel), harvest time, geographical and ecological conditions, extraction method, and the method for antimicrobial determination, including the types of bacterial strains tested (S. Burt, 2004; Randazzo, Jiménez-Belenguer, et al., 2016). In addition, the structural characteristics of the EOs' active compounds (i.e. aliphatic ring, hydroxyl group) may change depending on the extraction procedure applied and/or storage time, resulting in a different level of antimicrobial activity, such as that reported for carvacrol (Veldhuizen, Tjeerdsma-Van Bokhoven, Zweijtzer, Burt, & Haagsman, 2006).

249 In case of EO9, a MIC of 0.5% v/v was recorded against *E. coli* according to Nasir, Tafess, and
250 Abate (2015), while Sliti et al. (2015) reported higher values (1.5% v/v for *E. coli* and 1.0% for *S.*
251 *enteritidis*).
252

253 3.3. Explorative multivariate analysis of chemical composition and antibacterial activities

254 Since HCA gathers cases according to their overall similarity and PCA plots cases and variables
255 together to provide information on their correlation, the two methods are complementary in their
256 ability to present and discuss chemical and microbiological results (Alfonzo et al., 2017;
257 Bendiabdellah et al., 2014; Randazzo, Guarcello, et al., 2016).

258 HCA mainly classified the EOs into two mega-clusters at around 95% of their mutual dissimilarity
259 (Fig. 1); EO6 was clustered separately from the remaining EOs. In this last group, the EOs shared
260 66% of dissimilarity with EO1 and only 54% among themselves. In general, the high linkage
261 distance among the cases (>46%) reflects the high complexity of the EOs's chemical composition
262 and antimicrobial activity, which were used as variables for the HCA analysis.

263 Regarding PCA, EO1 and EO2 were not included in the analysis due to their negligible
264 antimicrobial activity (lowest PDDA values). Four Factors displayed eigenvalues higher than 1,
265 explaining 95.32% of the total variance (Table 3S). In particular, the scatterplots represent the
266 relationship between the three main Factors and EOs (score plot, Fig. 2A), and, between the three
267 main Factors and variables (loading plot, Fig. 2B), accounting for 82.59% of the total variance.
268 Factor 1 represents 33.69% of the total variance and it is positively correlated with OM and
269 negatively correlated with MH, OS and MIC (Fig. 2B and Table 4S). Factor 3 (22.64%) is
270 positively correlated with OM, OS, and MIC variables for both *E. coli* and *S. enterica*; it is the
271 Factor most correlated to the EOs' antimicrobial traits. Similarly, MH, EST, and OTH correlated
272 negatively with Factor 3. Interestingly, EO6 showed the highest correlation value with Factor 3
273 (associated with antimicrobial traits, Tab. 5S).

274 In summary, the discrimination of EOs based on the scatterplots highlighted differences among the
275 samples that resulted in widely spaced points (Fig. 2A). The PCA indicated a high correlation
276 among antimicrobial traits (MIC) and oxygenated compounds, like OM and OS as previously
277 reported for *Citrus* EOs (Randazzo, Jiménez-Belenguer, et al., 2016; Settanni et al., 2014).

278 3.4. Evaluation of the antibacterial activity of the EO-based sanitizer

279 According to the antibacterial results, EO6 was chosen to be prepared into a SAN solution to be
280 evaluated as food contact surface sanitizer according to official methods. The SAN's efficacy was
281 tested according to AOAC 960.09 and is reported in Table 3. In this case, the SAN containing 1%
282 of EO6 was highly effective, inhibiting approximately 8 log CFU/ml of *E. coli* and *S. enterica* after
283 30 and 60 seconds of contact time, respectively. According to method validation, a 99.999% (5 log
284 CFU/ml) reduction was achieved for both strains within 30 seconds. Consequently, the developed
285 SAN passed the validation recommended by the AOAC method.

286 Studies evaluating EOs for bacterial inhibition within food service environments remain somewhat
287 limited (Phillips, 2016; Simões et al., 2010). Therefore, this SAN was further evaluated at various
288 concentrations, cleanness conditions, contact times, and on different material surfaces commonly
289 employed in food industries (Figure 3, Figure 4 and Table 6S).

290 As expected, the SAN's inhibitions were higher when tested at higher percentages ($0.5 < 1 < 5\%$) and
291 for longer contact time ($1 < 5 < 10$ min) as reported by Messenger, Hammer, Carson, and Riley (2005)
292 for tea tree oil. The SAN was also tested on simulated clean and dirty surfaces (by preparing
293 bacterial inocula in 0.3 and 3.0 g/l BSA, respectively, as in ISO 13697:2015). Figures 3 and 4 show
294 titers of recovered *E. coli* and *S. enterica* on stainless steel, glass and polypropylene surfaces before,
295 and after 1, 5, and 10 min treatment with a 5% SAN solution.

296 Titters of control samples were 5.75 ± 0.14 and 5.63 ± 0.25 log CFU/ml for *E. coli* and *S. enterica*,
297 respectively. On clean stainless steel, the 5% SAN solution reduced *E. coli* counts by 1.38, 2.72,
298 and 3.60 log after 1, 5, and 10 min of exposure, respectively, while for *S. enterica* reductions of
299 0.32, 0.50 and 1.13 log were recorded. On clean glass, 0.77, 1.99 and 3.01 log reductions were

recorded for *E. coli* treated with the 5% SAN solution after 1, 5, and 10 min, respectively, and *S. enterica* was reduced by 0.33, 0.43, and 1.13 log. On clean polypropylene, 5% SAN reduced 0.94, 2.59 and 3.46 log *E. coli* and 0.23, 0.43 and 1.03 log *S. enterica* after 1, 5, and 10 min, respectively. Statistically significant inhibitions were reported for *S. enterica* after 10 min of contact with the 5% SAN solution under clean working conditions for the three material tested, with reductions of 1.03-1.13 log CFU/ml. Higher reductions have been reported by other authors when extending the time of contact. For instance, reductions of 3.71 to 7.41 log CFU/cm² were reported for *Salmonella* spp. biofilms on polypropylene treated for 1 h with 312 µg/ml (0.03%) of carvacrol (Amaral et al., 2015). Similarly, approximately 6 log CFU/cm² reductions were achieved for *Salmonella* spp attached on stainless steel after 10 min contact with 0.03% carvacrol (Engel et al., 2017). Generally, Gram-negative bacteria are more resistant than Gram-positive bacteria to EOs (Nazzaro, Fratianni, De Martino, Coppola, & De Feo, 2013), and, among Gram-negative bacteria, *E. coli* usually reported as more sensitive than *Salmonella* spp. (Semeniuc, Pop, & Rotar, 2017). The SAN's limited activity against *Salmonella* could be explained by the EO's effect on some outer membrane proteins involved in the formation of an efflux system (e.g. TolC), that may be up-regulated by the EO and constitute a final mechanism of resistance, as observed for thymol (Baucheron, Mouline, Praud, Chaslus-Dancla, & Cloeckaert, 2005). In general, the results showed more effectiveness on clean surfaces than on dirty ones, and significant differences ($p < 0.05$) were recorded among the different surface materials (Table 2S). Regarding the latter, the higher disinfectant efficacy of sanitizers on smooth (i.e. steel) rather than rough (i.e. plastic) surfaces has been previously reported (Lin, Sheu, Hsu, & Tsai, 2010). On all clean surfaces tested, the 5% SAN solution was able to reduce *E. coli* counts by more than 3 log CFU/ml compared to the control (99.9%). In dirty conditions, the 5% SAN solution achieved lower reductions (2.65 log CFU/ml on plastic). The presence of organic matter also reduced the effectiveness of chemical sanitizers, such as sodium hypochlorite (Kich et al., 2004; Souza & Daniel, 2005) or sodium dichloroisocyanurate (NaDCC) (Williams, Denyer, Hosein, Hill, &

326 Maillard, 2009), because the higher amount of proteins in dirty conditions may protect bacteria cells
327 from the disinfectant action, as previously reported (Hammer, Carson, and Riley (1999) and
328 Messenger et al. (2005)).

329 The 5% SAN solution was effective against both bacterial strains when applied for 10 min (Figures
330 3 and 4). These different inhibitions between the two bacteria could depend on the species and
331 strain tested, since various authors have reported heterogeneous antibacterial effects depending on
332 the bacterial species (S. Burt, 2004; Fisher & Phillips, 2008) and strain (Settanni et al., 2014). For
333 all the experiments, the ethanol used as a control did not show any significant inhibitory effect.

334 *T. capitata* EO demonstrated antimicrobial properties to certain extent, therefore, SAN
335 improvement should be evaluated for example by the addition of stabilizers (S. A. Burt, Vlieland, and
336 Haagsman, & Veldhuizen, 2005).

337

338 **Conclusions**

339 Considering the increasing resistance of bacteria to chemical compounds and sanitizers, searching
340 for natural antibacterial products is becoming a priority.

341 This study demonstrated the antimicrobial activity of *T. capitata* EO, and, for the first time, its
342 potential use as a natural sanitizing product.

343 The EO-based sanitizer was developed by applying official methods (AOAC 960.09 and ISO
344 13697:2015) and testing different concentrations (0.25, 0.5 and 2.5%), cleanness conditions (clean
345 and dirt), contact times (1, 5 and 10 minutes), and on stainless steel, glass and polypropylene
346 surfaces commonly employed in food industries. Finally, a natural sanitizer containing 2.5% of *T.*
347 *capitata* EO was effective against *E. coli* (> 3 log reduction in all three clean material tested), but
348 had limited effect on *S. enteridis* when evaluated on different food contact surfaces, suggesting an
349 interesting potential of its application in real conditions even further improvements are needed to
350 widen its efficacy against a wider range of bacterial pathogens.

351

352 **Acknowledgments**

353 This work was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (MINECO)
354 (RYC-2012-09950) and the Spanish National Institute for Agriculture and Food Research and
355 Technology (INIA) co-financed by the European Social Fund (Project RTA2014-00024-C03). GS
356 was supported by the “Ramon y Cajal” Young Investigator.

357 References

- 358 Adams, R. P. (2007). *Identification of Essential Oil Components by Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry*. Illinois,
359 USA.: Allured Publishing Corporation.
- 360 Alfonzo, A., Randazzo, W., Barbera, M., Sannino, C., Corona, O., Settanni, L., . . . Francesca, N. (2017). Effect of Salt
361 Concentration and Extremely Halophilic Archaea on the Safety and Quality Characteristics of Traditional
362 Salted Anchovies. *Journal of Aquatic Food Product Technology*, 1-18. doi:10.1080/10498850.2016.1251521
- 363 Amaral, V. C. S., Santos, P. R., da Silva, A. F., dos Santos, A. R., Machinski, M., & Mikcha, J. M. G. (2015). Effect of
364 carvacrol and thymol on *Salmonella* spp. biofilms on polypropylene. *International Journal of Food Science
365 and Technology*, 50(12), 2639-2643. doi:10.1111/ijfs.12934
- 366 Andrade, M. A., Cardoso, M. G., Batista, L. R., Freire, J. M., & Nelson, D. L. (2011). Antimicrobial activity and
367 chemical composition of essential oil of *Pelargonium odoratissimum*. *Revista Brasileira de Farmacognosia*,
368 21(1), 47-52.
- 369 Anwar, F., Alkharfy, K. M., Najeeb-ur-Rehman, Adam, E. H. K., & Gilani, A.-u.-H. (2017). Chemo-geographical
370 Variations in the Composition of Volatiles and the Biological Attributes of *Mentha longifolia* (L.) Essential
371 Oils from Saudi Arabia. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PHARMACOLOGY*, 13(5), 408-424.
- 372 Balouiri, M., Sadiki, M., & Ibnsouda, S. K. (2016). Methods for in vitro evaluating antimicrobial activity: A review.
373 *Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis*, 6(2), 71-79. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpha.2015.11.005>
- 374 Baucheron, S., Mouline, C., Praud, K., Chaslus-Dancla, E., & Cloeckaert, A. (2005). TolC but not AcrB is essential for
375 multidrug-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serotype Typhimurium colonization of chicks. *Journal of
376 Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*, 55(5), 707-712. doi:10.1093/jac/dki091
- 377 Bautista Gallego, J., Arroyo López, F. N., Romero Gil, V., Rodríguez Gómez, F., García García, P., & Garrido
378 Fernández, A. (2011). Chloride salt mixtures affect Gordan cv. green Spanish-style table olive fermentation.
379 *Food Microbiology*, 28(7), 1316-1325. doi:10.1016/j.fm.2011.06.002
- 380 Bel Hadj Salah-Fatnassi, K., Hassayoun, F., Cheraif, I., Khan, S., Jannet, H. B., Hammami, M., . . . Harzallah-Skhiri, F.
381 (2017). Chemical composition, antibacterial and antifungal activities of flowerhead and root essential oils of
382 *Santolina chamaecyparissus* L., growing wild in Tunisia. *Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences*, 24(4), 875-882.
383 doi:10.1016/j.sjbs.2016.03.005
- 384 Bendiabdellah, A., Dib, M. E. A., Djabou, N., Hassani, F., Paolini, J., Tabti, B., . . . Muselli, A. (2014). *Daucus carota*
385 ssp. *hispanicus* Gouan. essential oils: Chemical variability and fungitoxic activity. *Journal of Essential Oil
386 Research*, 26(6), 427-440. doi:10.1080/10412905.2014.956189
- 387 Bounatirou, S., Smiti, S., Miguel, M. G., Faleiro, L., Rejeb, M. N., Neffati, M., . . . Pedro, L. G. (2007). Chemical
388 composition, antioxidant and antibacterial activities of the essential oils isolated from Tunisian *Thymus*
389 *capitatus* Hoff. et Link. *Food Chemistry*, 105(1), 146-155. doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2007.03.059
- 390 Burt, S. (2004). Essential oils: their antibacterial properties and potential applications in foods—a review. *International
391 journal of food microbiology*, 94(3), 223-253.
- 392 Burt, S. A., Vlieland, R., Haagsman, H. P., & Veldhuizen, E. J. A. (2005). Increase in activity of essential oil
393 components carvacrol and thymol against *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 by addition of food stabilizers. *Journal of
394 Food Protection*, 68(5), 919-926.
- 395 Ceuppens, S., Johannessen, G. S., Allende, A., Tondo, E. C., El-Tahan, F., Sampers, I., . . . Uyttendaele, M. (2015).
396 Risk factors for *Salmonella*, shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* and *Campylobacter* occurrence in primary
397 production of leafy greens and strawberries. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public
398 Health*, 12(8), 9809-9831. doi:10.3390/ijerph120809809
- 399 Chang, S. T., Chen, P. F., & Chang, S. C. (2001). Antibacterial activity of leaf essential oils and their constituents from
400 *Cinnamomum osmophloeum*. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, 77(1), 123-127. doi:10.1016/S0378-
401 8741(01)00273-2
- 402 Chia, T. W. R., Goulter, R. M., McMeekin, T., Dykes, G. A., & Fegan, N. (2009). Attachment of different *Salmonella*
403 serovars to materials commonly used in a poultry processing plant. *Food Microbiology*, 26(8), 853-859.
404 doi:10.1016/j.fm.2009.05.012
- 405 Codex alimentarius. (2007). *Guidelines on the application of general principles of food hygiene to the control of
406 Listeria monocytogenes in foods*. (CAC/GL 61 - 2007).
- 407 Coroneo, V., Carraro, V., Marras, B., Marrucci, A., Succa, S., Meloni, B., . . . Schintu, M. (2017). Presence of
408 Trihalomethanes in ready-to-eat vegetables disinfected with chlorine. *Food Additives and Contaminants - Part
409 A Chemistry, Analysis, Control, Exposure and Risk Assessment*, 1-7. doi:10.1080/19440049.2017.1382723
- 410 da Cruz Cabral, L., Fernández Pinto, V., & Patriarca, A. (2013). Application of plant derived compounds to control
411 fungal spoilage and mycotoxin production in foods. *International journal of food microbiology*, 166(1), 1-14.
412 doi:10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2013.05.026
- 413 Davidson, P. M., & Harrison, M. A. (2002). Resistance and adaptation to food antimicrobials, sanitizers, and other
414 process controls. *Food Technology*, 56(11), 69-78.
- 415 Doyle, M. P. (2006). Dealing with antimicrobial resistance. *Food Technology*, 60(8), 22-29.

- Duffy, L. L., O'Callaghan, D., McAuley, C. M., Fegan, N., & Craven, H. M. (2009). Virulence properties of *Escherichia coli* isolated from Australian dairy powder factory environments. *International Dairy Journal*, 19(3), 178-179. doi:10.1016/j.idairyj.2008.09.002
- EFSA. (2016). The European Union summary report on trends and sources of zoonoses, zoonotic agents and food-borne outbreaks in 2015. *EFSA Journal*, 14(12), 4634. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2015.4329
- EN 13697:2015. Chemical disinfectants and antiseptics. Quantitative non-porous surface test for the evaluation of bactericidal and/or fungicidal activity of chemical disinfectants used in food, industrial, domestic and institutional areas. Test method and requirements without mechanical action (phase 2, step 2). In.
- Engel, J. B., Heckler, C., Tondo, E. C., Daroit, D. J., & da Silva Malheiros, P. (2017). Antimicrobial activity of free and liposome-encapsulated thymol and carvacrol against *Salmonella* and *Staphylococcus aureus* adhered to stainless steel. *International journal of food microbiology*, 252(Supplement C), 18-23. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodmicro.2017.04.003>
- Fisher, K., & Phillips, C. (2008). Potential antimicrobial uses of essential oils in food: is citrus the answer? *Trends in food science & technology*, 19(3), 156-164.
- Friedman, M. (2014). Chemistry and multibeneficial bioactivities of carvacrol (4-isopropyl-2-methylphenol), a component of essential oils produced by aromatic plants and spices. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 62(31), 7652-7670. doi:10.1021/jf5023862
- Giaouris, E., Heir, E., Hébraud, M., Chorianopoulos, N., Langsrud, S., Møretør, T., . . . Nychas, G.-J. (2014). Attachment and biofilm formation by foodborne bacteria in meat processing environments: Causes, implications, role of bacterial interactions and control by alternative novel methods. *Meat Science*, 97(3), 298-309. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2013.05.023>
- Halden, R. U. (2014). On the Need and Speed of Regulating Triclosan and Triclocarban in the United States. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 48(7), 3603-3611. doi:10.1021/es500495p
- Hammer, K., Carson, C., & Riley, T. (1999). Influence of organic matter, cations and surfactants on the antimicrobial activity of *Melaleuca alternifolia* (tea tree) oil in vitro. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 86(3), 446-452.
- Irkin, R., & Esmer, O. K. (2015). Novel food packaging systems with natural antimicrobial agents. *J Food Sci Technol*, 52(10), 6095-6111. doi:10.1007/s13197-015-1780-9
- Kamlesh, S., Ademola, O., Ramakrishna, N., Wes, S., Juan, S., Benjy, M., & Hartford, B. (2013). Inhibition and Inactivation of *Salmonella Typhimurium* Biofilms from Polystyrene and Stainless Steel Surfaces by Essential Oils and Phenolic Constituent Carvacrol. *Journal of Food Protection*, 76(2), 205-212. doi:10.4315/0362-028x.jfp-12-196
- Kich, J., Borowsky, L., Silva, V., Ramenzoni, M., Triques, N., Kooler, F., & Cardoso, M. (2004). Evaluation of the antibacterial activity of six commercial disinfectants against *Salmonella typhimurium* strains isolated from swine. *Acta Sci Vet*, 32, 33-39.
- Lin, C.-M., Sheu, S.-R., Hsu, S.-C., & Tsai, Y.-H. (2010). Determination of bactericidal efficacy of essential oil extracted from orange peel on the food contact surfaces. *Food Control*, 21(12), 1710-1715.
- Lis-Balchin, M., & Roth, G. (2000). Composition of the essential oils of *Pelargonium odoratissimum*, *P. exstipulatum*, and *P. × fragrans* (Geraniaceae) and their bioactivity. *Flavour and Fragrance Journal*, 15(6), 391-394.
- Marques, S. C., Rezende, J. D. G. O. S., Alves, L. A. D. F., Silva, B. C., Alves, E., De Abreu, L. R., & Piccoli, R. H. (2007). Formation of biofilms by *Staphylococcus aureus* on stainless steel and glass surfaces and its resistance to some selected chemical sanitizers. *Brazilian Journal of Microbiology*, 38(3), 538-543.
- Memar, M. Y., Raei, P., Alizadeh, N., Aghdam, M. A., & Kafil, H. S. (2017). Carvacrol and thymol: Strong antimicrobial agents against resistant isolates. *Reviews in Medical Microbiology*, 28(2), 63-68. doi:10.1097/MRM.000000000000100
- Messenger, S., Hammer, K., Carson, C., & Riley, T. (2005). Assessment of the antibacterial activity of tea tree oil using the European EN 1276 and EN 12054 standard suspension tests. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 59(2), 113-125.
- Mkaddem, M., Bouajila, J., Ennajar, M., Lebrihi, A., Mathieu, F., & Romdhane, M. (2009). Chemical composition and antimicrobial and antioxidant activities of *mentha* (*longifolia* L. and *viridis*) essential oils. *Journal of Food Science*, 74(7), M358-M363. doi:10.1111/j.1750-3841.2009.01272.x
- Nasir, M., Tafess, K., & Abate, D. (2015). Antimicrobial potential of the Ethiopian *Thymus schimperii* essential oil in comparison with others against certain fungal and bacterial species. *BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine*, 15(1). doi:10.1186/s12906-015-0784-3
- Nazzaro, F., Fratianni, F., De Martino, L., Coppola, R., & De Feo, V. (2013). Effect of Essential Oils on Pathogenic Bacteria. *Pharmaceuticals*, 6(12), 1451-1474. doi:10.3390/ph6121451
- Nostro, A., & Papalia, T. (2012). Antimicrobial activity of carvacrol: Current progress and future perspectives. *Recent Patents on Anti-Infective Drug Discovery*, 7(1), 28-35. doi:10.2174/157489112799829684
- Phillips, C. A. (2016). Bacterial biofilms in food processing environments: a review of recent developments in chemical and biological control. *International Journal of Food Science & Technology*, 51(8), 1731-1743. doi:10.1111/ijfs.13159

- 475 Randazzo, W., Guarcello, R., Francesca, N., Germanà, M. A., Erten, H., Moschetti, G., & Settanni, L. (2016).
 476 Development of new non-dairy beverages from Mediterranean fruit juices fermented with water kefir
 477 microorganisms. *Food Microbiology*, 54, 40-51. doi:10.1016/j.fm.2015.10.018
- 478 Randazzo, W., Jiménez-Belenguer, A., Settanni, L., Perdonés, A., Moschetti, M., Palazzolo, E., . . . Moschetti, G.
 479 (2016). Antilisterial effect of citrus essential oils and their performance in edible film formulations. *Food*
 480 *Control*, 59, 750-758.
- 481 Rhoades, J., Gialagkolidou, K., Gogou, M., Mavridou, O., Blatsiotis, N., Ritzoulis, C., & Likotrafiti, E. (2013). Oregano
 482 essential oil as an antimicrobial additive to detergent for hand washing and food contact surface cleaning.
 483 *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 115(4), 987-994. doi:10.1111/jam.12302
- 484 Riahi, L., Ghazghazi, H., Ayari, B., Aouadhi, C., Klay, I., Chograni, H., . . . Zoghalmi, N. (2015). Effect of
 485 environmental conditions on chemical polymorphism and biological activities among *Artemisia absinthium* L.
 486 essential oil provenances grown in Tunisia. *Industrial Crops and Products*, 66(1), 96-102.
 487 doi:10.1016/j.indcrop.2014.12.036
- 488 Salie, F., Eagles, P. F. K., & Leng, H. M. J. (1996). Preliminary antimicrobial screening of four South African
 489 Asteraceae species. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, 52(1), 27-33. doi:10.1016/0378-8741(96)01381-5
- 490 Sánchez, G., & Aznar, R. (2015). Evaluation of Natural Compounds of Plant Origin for Inactivation of Enteric Viruses.
 491 *Food and Environmental Virology*, 7(2), 183-187. doi:10.1007/s12560-015-9181-9
- 492 Semeniuc, C. A., Pop, C. R., & Rotar, A. M. (2017). Antibacterial activity and interactions of plant essential oil
 493 combinations against Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria. *Journal of Food and Drug Analysis*, 25(2),
 494 403-408. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfda.2016.06.002>
- 495 Settanni, L., Randazzo, W., Palazzolo, E., Moschetti, M., Aleo, A., Guarrasi, V., . . . Moschetti, G. (2014). Seasonal
 496 variations of antimicrobial activity and chemical composition of essential oils extracted from three *Citrus*
 497 *limon* L. Burm. cultivars. *Natural product research*, 28(6), 383-391.
- 498 Simões, M., Simões, L. C., & Vieira, M. J. (2010). A review of current and emergent biofilm control strategies. *LWT -*
 499 *Food Science and Technology*, 43(4), 573-583. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2009.12.008>
- 500 Sliti, S., Ayadi, S., Kachouri, F., Khouja, M. A., Abderrabba, M., & Bouzouita, N. (2015). Leaf essential oils chemical
 501 composition, antibacterial and antioxidant activities of eucalyptus camaldulensis and E. rudis from korbous
 502 (Tunisia). *Journal of Materials and Environmental Science*, 6(2), 531-537.
- 503 Souza, J. B. d., & Daniel, L. A. (2005). Comparison between sodium hypochlorite and peracetic acid for E. coli,
 504 coliphages and C. perfringens inactivation of high organic matter concentration water. *Engenharia Sanitaria e*
 505 *Ambiental*, 10(2), 111-117.
- 506 Todeschini, R. (1998). Introduzione alla chemiometria. *EdiSES, Napoli*, 321.
- 507 Torregiani, E., Lorier, S., Sagratini, G., Maggi, F., Vittori, S., & Caprioli, G. (2017). Comparative Analysis of the
 508 Volatile Profile of 20 Commercial Samples of Truffles, Truffle Sauces, and Truffle-Flavored Oils by Using
 509 HS-SPME-GC-MS. *Food Analytical Methods*, 10(6), 1857-1869. doi:10.1007/s12161-016-0749-2
- 510 Valeriano, C., de Oliveira, T. L. C., de Carvalho, S. M., Cardoso, M. D. G., Alves, E., & Piccoli, R. H. (2012). The
 511 sanitizing action of essential oil-based solutions against *Salmonella enterica* serotype Enteritidis S64 biofilm
 512 formation on AISI 304 stainless steel. *Food Control*, 25(2), 673-677. doi:10.1016/j.foodcont.2011.12.015
- 513 Van Haute, S., Raes, K., Devlieghere, F., & Sampaers, I. (2017). Combined use of cinnamon essential oil and
 514 MAP/vacuum packaging to increase the microbial and sensorial shelf life of lean pork and salmon. *Food*
 515 *Packaging and Shelf Life*, 12, 51-58. doi:10.1016/j.fpsl.2017.02.004
- 516 Veldhuizen, E. J. A., Tjeerdma-Van Bokhoven, J. L. M., Zweijter, C., Burt, S. A., & Haagsman, H. P. (2006).
 517 Structural requirements for the antimicrobial activity of carvacrol. *Journal of Agricultural and Food*
 518 *Chemistry*, 54(5), 1874-1879. doi:10.1021/jf052564y
- 519 Verdeguer, M., Blázquez, M. A., & Boira, H. (2009). Phytotoxic effects of *Lantana camara*, *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*
 520 and *Eriocephalus africanus* essential oils in weeds of Mediterranean summer crops. *Biochemical Systematics*
 521 *and Ecology*, 37(4), 362-369.
- 522 Williams, G. J., Denyer, S. P., Hosein, I. K., Hill, D. W., & Maillard, J. Y. (2009). Use of sodium dichloroisocyanurate
 523 for floor disinfection. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 72(3), 279-281.
 524 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2009.02.017>
- 525 World Health Organization, W. (2014). *Advancing food safety initiatives: strategic plan for food safety including*
 526 *foodborne zoonoses 2013-2022*.
- 527 Xue, R., Shi, H., Ma, Y., Yang, J., Hua, B., Inniss, E. C., . . . Eichholz, T. (2017). Evaluation of thirteen haloacetic acids
 528 and ten trihalomethanes formation by peracetic acid and chlorine drinking water disinfection. *Chemosphere*,
 529 189, 349-356. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2017.09.059
- 530 Yemiş, G. P., & Candoğan, K. (2017). Antibacterial activity of soy edible coatings incorporated with thyme and
 531 oregano essential oils on beef against pathogenic bacteria. *Food Science and Biotechnology*, 26(4), 1113-1121.
 532 doi:10.1007/s10068-017-0136-9

534 **Table 1.** Main chemical compounds (>10%) characterizing extracted EOs by GC and GC–MS analysis.

Compound ^{a,b}	Class compound	IK	EO1	EO2	EO3	EO4	EO5	EO6	EO7	EO8	EO9
Sabinene	MH	980		0.34	0.42	2.11	t		3.13	34.41	0.14
β-Pinene	MH	982	1.47	0.66	0.46	0.53	0.58	0.03	17.28	2.2	1.12
p-Cymene	MH	1027	0.73	0.50	3.40	0.10		1.69		0.17	28.34
Limonene	MH	1033		0.89		1.13		0.05	30.14	3.69	t
1.8-Cineole	OM	1037	0.07		11.74	4.72	1.34				6.99
Artemisia ketone	OM	1065	57.54		3.15						
Linalool	OM	1107		4.87		0.35	4.19	0.64	1.20	21.27	0.28
Epoxy-ocimene <(E)->	OM	1140		34.01							
Camphor	OM	1149		7.96	31.43		0.87				
Cryptone	OM	1192									14.12
α-Terpineol	OM	1195		t		3.09	12.60	0.02	0.34	0.77	1.01
Citronellol	OM	1237					20.40				
Pulegone	OM	1245				14.15					
Geraniol	OM	1250					12.30		0.65		
cis-Chrysanthenyl acetate	OM	1267		28.35							
Geranial	OM	1269		t			1.20		11.91	0.02	
Carvacrol	OM	1317						91.56			
α-Terpineol acetate	OM	1353				32.59					
β-Copaen-4-α-ol	OS	1580			10.11						
Carvone acetate	OM	1574				10.29					
Spathulenol	OS	1580	1.32								17.99
Intermedeol	OS	1667	10.54	0.07							
Monoterpene hydrocarbons. (MH)			5.98	4.56	11.17	6.41	2.05	3.25	59.11	64.47	34.66
Oxygenated monoterpenes. (OM)			66.03	80.16	66.16	87.44	75.1	93.31	34.51	28.82	38.61
Sesquiterpene hydrocarbons. (SH)			0.6	5.05	2.9	3.56		2.17	3.15	1.66	0.83
Oxygenated sesquiterpenes. (OS)			21.35	0.85	14.31	0.30	1.52	0.53		4.25	21.82

Esters. (EST)	0.04		0.38	0.83					
Others. (OTH)		2.07	0.38	0.66	17.25	0.05	0.42		
Total identified (%)	94.00	92.69	95.30	99.19	95.92	99.31	97.19	99.20	95.92

535 ^aCompounds listed in order of elution in the ZB-5 column.

536 ^bThe complete list of identified compounds is in Table 6S.

537 t. traces (<0.02%); IK. Kovats retention index relative to C₈–C₂₅ n-alkanes on the ZB-5 column.

538

539 **Table 2.** Inhibitory activity of EOs tested by paper disc diffusion assay (PDDA) and minimum
540 inhibitory concentration (MIC)

	<i>Escherichia coli</i>		<i>Salmonella enterica</i>	
	PDDA (cm)	MIC (%)	PDDA (cm)	MIC (%)
EO1	1.00±0.00	nd	1.00±0.00	nd
EO2	1.10±0.00	nd	1.10±0.00	nd
EO3	1.43±0.19	0.5	1.60±0.18	1
EO4	1.58±0.10	1	1.33±0.10	1
EO5	1.88±0.15	1	1.88±0.12	1
EO6	2.75±0.35	0.05	2.47±0.28	0.05
EO7	1.45±0.06	0.5	1.38±0.05	>1
EO8	1.75±0.10	0.5	2.23±0.26	0.5
EO9	1.83±0.13	0.5	1.50±0.00	0.5

541
542 nd. not determined. The results are expressed in cm and represent the mean value of the inhibition haloes of four determinations (carried out in
543 duplicate and repeated twice) ± standard deviation.
544

545 **Table 3.** Evaluation of 1% natural sanitizing solution (SAN) against *Escherichia coli* and
 546 *Salmonella enterica* after 30 and 60 seconds of contact time according to AOAC 960.09 standard
 547 method.

	<i>Escherichia coli</i>				<i>Salmonella enterica</i>			
	30"	30"	60"	60"	30"	30"	60"	60"
	Plate counts (log CFU/ml)	Reduction	Plate counts (log CFU/ml)	Reduction	Plate counts (log CFU/ml)	Reduction	Plate counts (log CFU/ml)	Reduction
Untreated	8.28±0.56	-	8.28±0.56	-	7.83±0.16	-	7.83±0.16	-
Ethanol 1%	8.00±0.13	0.28	8.05±0.25	0.23	7.72±0.03	0.11	7.65±0.03	0.18
SAN 1%	0	8.28	0	8.28	2.32±0.01	5.51	0	7.83

548
 549

550

551 **Figure 1.** Hierarchical clustering analysis of the nine essential oils according to their chemical and
552 antimicrobial characterizations.

567 Abbreviations: EO1. *Eriosephalus africanus*; EO2. *Artemisia absinthium*; EO3. *Santolina chamaecyparissus*; EO4.
568 *Mentha longifolia*; EO5. *Pelargonium odoratissimum*; EO6. *Thymbra capitata*; EO7. *Citrus limon*; EO8. *Citrus*
569 *reticulata*; EO9. *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*.

570

571

572 **Figure 2.** Principal component analysis based on chemical compositions and antimicrobial activity
 573 of essential oils. Scatterplots show relationship between Factors and essential oils samples (score
 574 plot. A). and variables (loading plot. B).

575 Abbreviations: EO1. *Eriocephalus africanus*; EO2. *Artemisia absinthium*; EO3. *Santolina chamaecyparissus*; EO4.
 576 *Mentha longifolia*; EO5. *Pelargonium odoratissimum*; EO6. *Thymbra capitata*; EO7. *Citrus limon*; EO8. *Citrus*
 577 *reticulata*; EO9. *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*. MIC E. coli and S. enterica, minimum inhibitory concentration for *E. coli*
 578 and *S. enterica*. respectively; MH. monoterpene hydrocarbons; OM. oxygenated monoterpenes; SH. sesquiterpene
 579 hydrocarbons; OS. oxygenated sesquiterpenes; EST. esters; OTH. others.

581

582

583 **Figure 3.** Bactericidal activity of 5% of a natural sanitizing solution (SAN) against *Escherichia coli*
 584 on different food contact surfaces (stainless steel, glass and polypropylene, PP, discs) cleanliness
 585 conditions and contact times according to EN 13697:2015.

586 Error bars indicate standard errors of the means. For each contact time, samples with different
 587 letters are statistically different according to the analysis of variance followed by Tukey's test
 588 ($p \leq 0.05$).
 589

590

591 **Figure 4.** Bactericidal activity of 5% of a natural sanitizing solution (SAN) against *Salmonella*
 592 *enterica* on different food contact surfaces (stainless steel, glass and polypropylene discs) cleanness
 593 conditions and contact times. according to EN 13697:2015.

594
 595 Error bars indicate standard errors of the means. For each contact time, samples with different
 596 letters are statistically different according to the analysis of variance followed by Tukey's test
 597 ($p \leq 0.05$).

598