

## Comparing Two Disinfectants Through a Price Analysis

Hutto E.

### ABSTRACT

Choosing the right disinfectant and format to fit your facilities disinfection needs is impacted by many important factors. Formats range from Ready-to-Use (RTU) spray liquid, RTU disposable wipes or dilutable concentrate solutions. Often times, concentrated disinfectants are presumed to be the more cost-effective option in comparison to RTU products, however when considering other factors such as compliance, shelf life, labor costs, compatibility, time, efficacy and convenience, these factors can highlight the benefits and overall cost savings of RTU disinfectants.

### STUDY

The initial price analysis based on a direct volume to volume comparison for a 21 oz. bottle, displayed an initial price gap that would decrease as more factors were taken into consideration.

AHP® proved to be a less wasteful product in comparison to chlorine dioxide. This was due to AHP® RTU being filled only when the solution ran out, thereby eliminating waste and proving to be cost efficient.

An analysis of labor costs showed that the chlorine dioxide product was more laborious requiring weekly collection, dilution preparation (15 minutes/gallon), re-dispersing of the bottles and longer speed of disinfection (5 minutes). Whereas, AHP® was only refilled as needed and had a speed of disinfection that was 5 times faster (1 minute). Greater time required meant higher costs associated with chlorine dioxide making the AHP® RTU solution practically equivalent in price.

Finally, factors beyond monetary value were considered such as convenience, along with the effects on equipment and personnel. The significantly shorter contact time of AHP® RTU disinfectant gave staff greater confidence that they were achieving disinfection, while remaining safe on their equipment and staff.

### RESULTS

The initial price analysis based on a direct volume to volume comparison for a 21 oz. bottle, displayed an initial price gap that would decrease as more factors were taken into consideration.

AHP® proved to be a less wasteful product in comparison to chlorine dioxide. This was due to AHP® RTU being filled only when the solution ran out, thereby eliminating waste and proving to be cost efficient.

An analysis of labor costs showed that the chlorine dioxide product was more laborious requiring weekly collection, dilution preparation (15 minutes/gallon), re-dispersing of the bottles and longer speed of disinfection (5 minutes). Whereas, AHP® was only refilled as needed and had a speed of disinfection that was 5 times faster (1 minute). Greater time required meant higher costs associated with chlorine dioxide making the AHP® RTU solution practically equivalent in price.

Finally, factors beyond monetary value were considered such as convenience, along with the effects on equipment and personnel. The significantly shorter contact time of AHP® RTU disinfectant gave staff greater confidence that they were achieving disinfection, while remaining safe on their equipment and staff.

## CONCLUSION

Many factors were considered when evaluating a new disinfectant and product format for this facility. A comprehensive analysis of both monetary and non-monetary factors proved that the AHP<sup>®</sup> RTU disinfectant was in fact the best fit for the facility. Taking into consideration the corrosive nature of chlorine dioxide disinfectants on stainless steel surfaces, AHP<sup>®</sup> RTU disinfectant was not only safer on equipment but also on staff. It also proved to be more efficacious and efficient with faster contact times, and presented staff greater confidence in disinfection as it was simple to use

with no dilutions required. These were all factors that far outweighed the upfront cost of the disinfectant making the switch to AHP<sup>®</sup> RTU disinfectants, an easy one.

---

## REFERENCE

1. Hutto E., (2018). Comparing Two Disinfectants Through a Price Analysis. *Abstracts of Scientific Sessions – Poster Sessions 2018 AALAS National Meeting.* (43)

