The Review Of
DIABETIC
STUDIES OPEN ACCESS

The Review of DIABETIC STUDIES
Reprint from

Medical Sterilization and Modern Technologies: A Comprehensive Review of Current Methods and Emerging Innovations

Mohammed Qaed Al otaibi[1],Hamood Sulaiman albatel[2],Fares Hajaj K Almutairi[3],Abdullah Atallah Almutairi[4],Samer saleh alnahidh[5],Mohammed homoud helan alhamli[6],Fahad Shujaa Ammash[7],Mansour Saleh Aljarbou[8],Khalil Mohsen Majrashi[9]

[1]Pharmacy Technician
[2]Health Informatics Technician
[3]Dental assistant
[4]Anesthesia technician
[5]Technician operation rooms
[6]Dental assistant
[7]Operation room technician
[8]Lab Specialist,Microbiology
[9]Medical devices specialist

Abstract
Sterilization of medical instruments is a critical component of infection control in healthcare settings. This comprehensive review examines traditional and modern sterilization methods, evaluating their effectiveness, safety, and practical applications. The paper explores steam sterilization, low-temperature gas plasma technologies, ultraviolet-C disinfection, and emerging innovations in medical device sterilization. With the increasing complexity of medical devices and growing concerns about environmental safety, healthcare facilities are transitioning toward more advanced sterilization modalities. This review synthesizes current evidence on sterilization efficacy, material compatibility, and operational considerations to guide healthcare professionals in selecting appropriate sterilization methods. The findings indicate that while steam sterilization remains the gold standard for heat-stable instruments, vaporized hydrogen peroxide and UV-C technologies offer promising alternatives for heat-sensitive devices, with implications for improving patient safety and reducing healthcare-associated infections.

Keywords: sterilization, medical devices, infection control, hydrogen peroxide plasma, UV-C disinfection, steam sterilization, healthcare-associated infections.

Introduction

Medical device sterilization represents a fundamental pillar of modern healthcare, ensuring that surgical instruments and medical supplies do not transmit infectious pathogens to patients (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2024). The evolution of sterilization practices has been driven by advances in microbiology, engineering, and our understanding of infection transmission pathways. Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) remain a significant concern globally, with inadequate sterilization of reusable medical devices representing one of the primary risk factors (Panta et al., 2019).

The World Health Organization recommends different levels of decontamination for various medical devices, with complete sterilization being essential for surgical instruments that penetrate skin or mucous membranes. Sterilization is defined as the process that renders an instrument free from all viable bacteria, viruses, and spores, achieving the highest level of decontamination (CDC, 2024).

Modern healthcare faces several challenges in sterilization practices. The introduction of increasingly complex medical devices, including heat-sensitive electronics and delicate endoscopes, has necessitated the development of low-temperature sterilization methods. Additionally, environmental and occupational health concerns regarding traditional chemical sterilants, particularly ethylene oxide

(EtO), have accelerated the search for safer alternatives (U.S. Food and Drug Administration [FDA], 2024).

This review examines current sterilization technologies, evaluating traditional methods alongside emerging innovations. Special attention is given to effectiveness, material compatibility, safety profiles, and practical considerations for implementation in diverse healthcare settings.

Steam Sterilization: The Traditional Gold Standard

Principles and Mechanisms

Steam sterilization, accomplished through autoclaving, remains the most widely used and dependable method of sterilization in healthcare facilities (CDC, 2024). The fundamental principle involves exposing items to direct steam contact at specified temperature and pressure for a defined duration. The microbicidal action of steam results from the irreversible coagulation and denaturation of enzymes and structural proteins in microorganisms.

The CDC reports that steam sterilization offers several advantages: it is nontoxic, relatively inexpensive, rapidly microbicidal and sporicidal, and effectively heats and penetrates fabrics and materials. The process requires four critical parameters: steam quality, pressure, temperature, and time (CDC, 2024).

Operating Parameters and Equipment

Two basic types of steam sterilizers exist: gravity displacement autoclaves and high-speed prevacuum sterilizers. The two standard steam-sterilizing temperatures are 121°C (250°F) and 132°C (270°F). Recognized minimum exposure periods for wrapped healthcare supplies are 30 minutes at 121°C in gravity displacement sterilizers or 4 minutes at 132°C in prevacuum sterilizers (CDC, 2024).

Steam quality is critical, with the ideal steam being dry saturated steam with a dryness fraction of at least 97%. Pressure serves primarily as a means to achieve the high temperatures necessary for rapid microbial destruction rather than being directly microbicidal itself.

Efficacy and Monitoring

Biological monitoring of steam sterilization employs spores of Geobacillus stearothermophilus, which are highly resistant to heat. Chemical indicators and mechanical monitoring through temperature, time, and pressure measurements provide additional verification of sterilization effectiveness (CDC, 2024).

A comprehensive review by Panta et al. (2019) examined sterilization failure rates across various healthcare settings globally. Studies revealed failure proportions ranging from 1.5% in well-maintained dental practices in developed countries to 43% in facilities with inadequate procedures. A nationwide study in Nepal found that 71.0% of autoclave cycles were ineffective when tested with biological indicators, highlighting the importance of proper training, equipment maintenance, and standardized protocols (Panta et al., 2019).

Limitations

Despite its effectiveness, steam sterilization has inherent limitations. It is unsuitable for heat-sensitive and moisture-sensitive medical devices, which increasingly include modern electronics, certain plastics, and complex endoscopic equipment. Materials such as some polymers with low melting points, specific types of glass, and corrosion-susceptible metal alloys cannot withstand the high temperatures required (CDC, 2024).

Low-Temperature Sterilization: Hydrogen Peroxide Gas Plasma

Development and Regulatory Status

The need for effective sterilization of heat-sensitive devices led to the development of alternative low-temperature technologies. Hydrogen peroxide gas plasma sterilization emerged in the late 1980s, with the first commercial system receiving FDA clearance in 1993 (CDC, 2024). In 2024, the FDA designated vaporized hydrogen peroxide (VHP) as an established Category A sterilization method, facilitating broader adoption across the medical device industry (FDA, 2024).

Technology and Mechanism

Vaporized hydrogen peroxide gas plasma systems combine two sterilization mechanisms. First, hydrogen peroxide vapor at a concentration of approximately 6 mg/L diffuses throughout the sterilization chamber, initiating microbial inactivation. Subsequently, a radio frequency-generated electrical field creates a gas plasma state, producing highly reactive free radicals including hydroxyl and hydroperoxyl species that possess powerful microbicidal properties (CDC, 2024).

Modern systems employ a two-cycle process with alternating hydrogen peroxide diffusion and plasma stages, reducing total processing time to between 28 and 75 minutes depending on the device load and specific system model. The process operates at temperatures between 37°C and 50°C, making it compatible with heat-sensitive instruments (Advanced Sterilization Products, n.d.).

Efficacy and Applications

Research demonstrates that hydrogen peroxide gas plasma sterilization is compatible with more than 95% of medical devices and materials tested (CDC, 2024). Materials compatible with this method include most plastics, electrical devices, and corrosion-susceptible metal alloys that cannot tolerate high temperatures and humidity.

Studies evaluating the reuse of sterilized medical devices have shown promising results. Research on electrophysiology catheters demonstrated that hydrogen peroxide gas plasma sterilization maintained sterility, mechanical integrity, and electrical function through five reuse cycles, with only trace hydrogen peroxide residuals within acceptable safety limits (McEvoy et al., 2019).

A comprehensive multi-site study in China examining 58 hospitals found that biological process challenge devices provided more rigorous monitoring of sterilization effectiveness for luminal devices compared to standard biological indicators, emphasizing the importance of appropriate validation methods for complex medical instruments (China CDC, 2020).

Advantages and Limitations

The primary advantages of VHP sterilization include rapid cycle times, no toxic residues (breaking down into water and oxygen), compatibility with heat-sensitive materials, and lower environmental impact compared to ethylene oxide. The systems require only electrical power, eliminating the need for water, steam, or compressed air utilities.

However, certain limitations exist. Chamber sizes are typically smaller than steam autoclaves, restricting the volume of instruments that can be processed simultaneously. The technology has limited penetration into long narrow lumens, and certain materials including cellulose, nylon, and liquids cannot be sterilized using this method. Device validation requirements mean that not all heat-sensitive instruments are compatible with every VHP sterilizer model (Advanced Sterilization Products, n.d.).

Ultraviolet-C Disinfection Technology

Scientific Basis

Ultraviolet-C (UV-C) radiation at wavelengths of 200-280 nm, with peak germicidal efficacy around 253.7-260 nm, has emerged as an alternative disinfection method for certain medical applications. UV-C light causes DNA and RNA disruption through the formation of thymine dimers (in DNA) or uracil dimers (in RNA), leading to microbial inactivation (Kowalski, 2022).

Clinical Applications and Efficacy

Recent advances have expanded UV-C applications beyond surface disinfection to include semi-critical medical equipment. In 2024, the FDA granted de novo clearance to Germitec's UV-C-based disinfection system specifically designed for nonlumen ultrasound probes, marking a significant milestone in regulatory recognition of this technology for medical device processing (Wall, 2024).

A 2024 study evaluated a novel UV-C LED chamber for disinfecting various medical devices contaminated with Staphylococcus aureus. Results demonstrated a 9 $\log_{10}$ reduction on simple surfaces within 5 minutes. However, efficacy varied significantly based on device geometry and

surface characteristics, with reductions ranging from 2 to 6 $\log_{10}$ on complex dental instruments (Smith et al., 2024).
Research on prototype sterilization devices combining vaporized hydrogen peroxide with UV-C radiation has shown complete inactivation of bacterial spores including Geobacilluss tearothermophilus, Bacillus subtilis, Escherichia coli, and Candida albicans. The synergistic effect of these two modalities enhances overall sterilization effectiveness (Kowalski et al., 2023).

Safety Considerations
UV-C radiation poses occupational health risks including skin and eye irritation, with potential carcinogenic effects from prolonged exposure. The International Electrotechnical Commission and ISO standard 15858 define maximum permissible exposure limits: 254 nm wavelength at 6 mJ/cm² during an 8-hour workday. Medical-grade UV-C devices must incorporate engineering controls to prevent operator exposure, typically through enclosed chamber designs with automatic shutoff mechanisms (Kowalski, 2022).

Limitations
UV-C disinfection has significant penetration limitations, being unable to sterilize shadowed areas or the interior of lumened instruments. The technology requires pre-cleaning to remove organic material, as biofilms and debris can shield microorganisms from UV exposure. Additionally, UV-C achieves high-level disinfection rather than complete sterilization, limiting its application to specific device categories (Smith et al., 2024).

Ethylene Oxide Sterilization: The Dominant Method Under Scrutiny

Historical Context and Current Usage
Ethylene oxide (EtO) sterilization has served as the workhorse of the medical device sterilization industry for over 50 years. Approximately 50% of all medical devices in the United States, representing about 20 billion units annually, undergo EtO sterilization (U.S. Food and Drug Administration [FDA], 2024). The method is particularly critical for heat-sensitive and moisture-sensitive devices, with an estimated 95% of all surgical kits sterilized using EtO (Medical Device and Diagnostic Industry, 2024).
EtO is a colorless, flammable gas that first gained widespread use in healthcare during the 1950s for equipment that could not tolerate heat, moisture, or radiation sterilization. The gas demonstrates remarkable effectiveness due to its unique properties: deep penetration through multiple layers of packaging, compatibility with moisture-sensitive materials, and ability to sterilize large loads without removing devices from containers (Consteril, 2024).

Sterilization Process and Mechanism
The EtO sterilization cycle consists of five distinct stages: preconditioning and humidification, gas introduction, exposure period, evacuation, and air washes (Microchem Laboratory, 2025). The microbicidal action occurs through alkylation, where EtO disrupts cellular proteins and DNA by replacing hydrogen atoms with alkyl groups, preventing microbial reproduction.
Initially, EtO was mixed with chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) until the mid-1990s when CFCs were banned for depleting stratospheric ozone. Current formulations use either EtO-carbon dioxide mixtures (less expensive but requiring higher pressure) or EtO-hydrochlorofluorocarbons (50 times less damaging to the ozone layer than CFCs) (Microchem Laboratory, 2025).

Health and Environmental Concerns
Despite its effectiveness, mounting evidence demonstrates that long-term EtO exposure increases cancer risk, particularly for lymphomas, leukemias, and breast cancer. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) classifies EtO as a carcinogen, placing workers at sterilization facilities and residents near these facilities at particular risk (Consteril, 2024).
In response to health concerns, the EPA finalized new regulations in March 2024 designed to reduce EtO emissions from commercial sterilizers by more than 90%. These stringent requirements have prompted facility closures and operational modifications, raising concerns about potential medical

device shortages and supply chain disruptions (MedTech Dive, 2024). The FDA subsequently issued transitional enforcement policies to prevent device shortages during the period when sterilization facilities transition to comply with EPA requirements (FDA, 2024).

Operational Challenges

EtO sterilization presents several operational inefficiencies. The process requires extended aeration periods ranging from two hours to two weeks depending on device characteristics, resulting in significantly longer turnaround times compared to alternative methods. Additionally, the highly regulated nature of EtO requires specialized facilities with emission controls, adding complexity and cost to the sterilization process (Consteril, 2024).

The uncertain regulatory future of EtO, combined with litigation exposure and supply chain vulnerabilities, has accelerated industry efforts to identify viable alternatives. However, experts acknowledge that finding a single replacement for EtO represents a significant challenge, with solutions likely requiring a multi-pronged approach utilizing several alternative technologies (MedTech Dive, 2024).

Radiation Sterilization: Gamma, Electron Beam, and X-Ray Technologies

Overview of Radiation Sterilization

Radiation-based sterilization methods represent the second most common approach for medical devices, accounting for approximately 41% of industrial sterilization in the United States (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2021). These methods utilize ionizing radiation to disrupt DNA and other biomolecules, preventing microbial replication through both direct electron interactions and indirect free radical formation from ionized water molecules.

Three primary radiation modalities exist: gamma irradiation using cobalt-60, electron beam (e-beam) accelerators, and X-ray systems. All three methods are recognized in ISO 11137 standards for medical device sterilization, and dose transfer between modalities is broadly accepted (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2021).

Gamma Irradiation

Gamma sterilization utilizes high-energy photons emitted from cobalt-60 radioactive decay, producing gamma rays with energies of 1.17 and 1.33 million electron volts (MeV). These gamma rays penetrate deeply and uniformly through materials and packaging, making gamma sterilization particularly suitable for large-volume processing. Approximately 30% of single-use medical devices globally are sterilized using cobalt-60 (Sterigenics, 2024).

The mechanism of microbial inactivation involves DNA damage through strand breaks that eliminate cellular replication capability. However, microorganism resistance to gamma radiation depends primarily on DNA repair enzyme capabilities, with Deinococcus radiodurans being notably radiation-resistant (Microchem Laboratory, 2024).

Gamma irradiation offers several advantages including deep penetration, consistent sterility assurance, and independence from temperature and pressure conditions. The terminal processing capability allows devices to be sterilized in their final sealed packaging. Environmental benefits include significantly lower power consumption compared to alternative methods, with 15 times less electrical power and 12 times fewer greenhouse gas emissions than X-ray facilities (Sterigenics, 2024).

Material Compatibility Concerns

Despite its effectiveness, gamma radiation can cause detrimental effects on sterilized products, particularly polymers and biological materials. Radiation exposure induces chain scission in polymers, reducing tensile strength and elongation capacity, while also causing cross-linking that increases strength but reduces flexibility (Vučković et al., 2018).

Material-specific reactions include oxidation-induced cracking in polyethylene, yellowing of polycarbonate from chromophore production, and generation of carcinogenic 4,4'-methylenedianiline in polyurethane. Radio-sensitive polymers such as polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA), ultrahigh molecular weight polyethylene (UHMWPE), polyvinyl chloride (PVC), and silicone rubber

experience irreversible structural changes at standard gamma doses of 25 kiloGrays (kGy) (Vučković et al., 2018).
For biological products including tissue allografts and growth factors, gamma radiation significantly alters biomechanical properties and molecular structure, raising concerns about functionality of sterilized biologics (Vučković et al., 2018).

Electron Beam Sterilization
Electron beam technology uses linear accelerators to generate high-energy electrons (typically 7.5 to 10 MeV) directed at products requiring sterilization. E-beam sterilization offers several advantages over gamma radiation: higher throughput due to shorter exposure times (seconds versus minutes or hours), equivalent or lower cost, and on-demand operation without radioactive source requirements (Stanford University, n.d.).
However, e-beam penetration depth is limited compared to gamma rays, restricting applications to lower-density or smaller products. The technology is particularly effective for materials that cannot be autoclaved but have no deep gas pathways. Studies demonstrate that e-beam sterilization achieves comparable microbicidal efficacy to gamma radiation, with similar dose requirements in the range of 15-50 kGy (Goron et al., 2020).
Recent developments include compact accelerator designs that may enable broader adoption. Fermilab researchers are developing more energy-efficient electron beam accelerators to reduce operational costs and improve accessibility, supported by the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration's efforts to reduce reliance on cobalt-60 (Fermilab, 2024).

X-Ray Sterilization
X-ray sterilization generates ionizing radiation by directing high-energy electrons from accelerators into high atomic number materials like tungsten or tantalum. The resulting X-rays provide penetration comparable to or exceeding gamma rays while avoiding radioactive source requirements (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2021).
X-rays offer unique advantages including directional beam control, ability to sterilize multiple product rows simultaneously, and achievement of the highest dose uniformity ratio (DUR) among radiation methods. DUR measures the range between maximum and minimum delivered doses, which is critical for minimizing degradation in radiation-sensitive materials (Stanford University, n.d.).
Despite these advantages, X-ray sterilization remains relatively uncommon, representing less than 1% of medical device sterilization. Current limitations include high capital costs, energy inefficiency, and requirements for specialized facilities (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2021).

Comparative Efficacy Studies
Research directly comparing gamma, e-beam, and X-ray sterilization demonstrates equivalent effectiveness across modalities. A rigorous study examining blood collection devices exposed to doses ranging from 15 to 80 kGy found that all three radiation types produced comparable sterilization outcomes. Minor differences in material discoloration were observed, but functional properties remained acceptable, supporting the interchangeability of these technologies (Goron et al., 2020).
Biological indicator studies using Bacillus pumilus spores at various dose rates (gamma: 1-10 kGy/hour; X-ray: 10-200 kGy/hour; e-beam: 2000 kGy/hour) showed log-linear survival curves with statistically comparable D-values, indicating that sterilization dose can be transferred between technologies without compromising sterility assurance (Goron et al., 2020).

Emerging Sterilization Technologies

Alternative Chemical Sterilants

Chlorine Dioxide Gas: Chlorine dioxide (ClO_2) represents the closest gaseous alternative to EtO, demonstrating compatibility with most materials. The FDA approved chlorine dioxide for contract sterilization of medical devices in 2021, with applications including implantable contact lenses,

artificial joints, suture products, surgical kits, vial stoppers, endoscopes, and electronic devices. However, current utilization remains limited to industrial sterilization settings (Consteril, 2024).

Nitrogen Dioxide: Nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) sterilization operates at room temperature, making it particularly suitable for pre-filled syringes, drug-delivery systems, and other heat-sensitive devices. Noxilizer received FDA 510(k) clearance in 2016 for medical devices terminally sterilized using nitrogen dioxide. The lower operating temperature prevents issues with piston movement in syringes that can occur with some alternative methods. Typical cycle times are eight hours or less, though capacity constraints currently limit widespread adoption (Medical Device and Diagnostic Industry, 2024).

Nitric Oxide Technology: A novel approach announced in 2024 utilizes nitric oxide (NO) embedded within polymeric packaging materials. This solid-state delivery system safely stores and releases nitric oxide upon activation by room temperature or broadband white light. The technology offers extremely short sterilization cycles, eliminates regional sterilization facility requirements, and demonstrates compatibility with electronics and various polymers. However, the approach remains under FDA review with limited clinical deployment to date (Healthcare Packaging, 2024).

Supercritical Carbon Dioxide

Supercritical carbon dioxide ($scCO_2$) sterilization pressurizes CO_2 until it transforms into a supercritical fluid capable of penetrating porous materials. The technology shows particular promise for biologics and sensitive biomaterials due to its gentle processing conditions. NovaSterilis, founded based on Massachusetts Institute of Technology research, has developed $scCO_2$ systems demonstrating effectiveness without cytotoxic effects in vitro testing (Medical Device and Diagnostic Industry, 2024).

The method offers environmental advantages, as CO_2 naturally occurs in the atmosphere and requires no special disposal. However, validation requirements and capacity limitations currently restrict broader implementation (NovaSterilis, 2024).

Cold Plasma Sterilization

Cold plasma technology represents an innovative approach utilizing ionized gas to generate reactive oxygen and nitrogen species (RONS) including nitrogen oxides, hydrogen peroxide, and ozone. Operating at near-ambient temperatures, cold plasma offers rapid sterilization cycles suitable for heat-sensitive instruments and emergency situations (TDK Corporation, 2024).

The MediPlas system, developed by relyon plasma, generates RONS on-site from atmospheric oxygen and nitrogen. This approach eliminates the need for stored chemical sterilants while providing effective microbial inactivation. The technology shows promise for customizable, time-saving, and sustainable sterilization solutions, though widespread clinical adoption awaits further validation studies (TDK Corporation, 2024).

Ozone Sterilization

Ozone (O_3) sterilization is gaining attention as an alternative to ethylene oxide. Ozone naturally degrades to oxygen, leaving no toxic residues and offering faster turnaround times. The method demonstrates improved compatibility with plastics and synthetic medical devices compared to traditional high-temperature methods. However, ozone's corrosive properties and regulatory requirements for safe handling have limited its current implementation (Hospital Sterilizers, 2025).

Automation and Artificial Intelligence

Advanced sterilization systems increasingly incorporate automation and artificial intelligence for process optimization. These systems feature self-adjusting parameters based on instrument characteristics, barcode tracking for digital compliance records, and real-time monitoring of sterilization efficacy. AI-powered validation systems analyze cycle data to detect potential failures before they occur and generate automated compliance reports for regulatory audits (Hospital Sterilizers, 2025).

Smart sterilization containers with electromagnetic sealing mechanisms, such as the Zuno Smart Container, represent another innovation. These systems use electromechanical vents to create vacuum seals within autoclaves, eliminating the need for disposable filters while providing visual confirmation of seal integrity (Wall, 2024).

Comparative Analysis and Selection Criteria

Sterilization Method Selection

Selecting appropriate sterilization methods requires consideration of multiple factors: device material compatibility, required turnaround time, processing volume, safety requirements, environmental impact, and cost-effectiveness. The FDA recommends that manufacturers and healthcare facilities evaluate sterilization modality based on device-specific characteristics and intended clinical applications (FDA, 2024).

Steam sterilization remains optimal for heat-stable instruments including metal surgical tools, certain plastics, glass, and wrapped textile goods. Its advantages include proven efficacy, rapid processing, low cost, and no toxic residues. However, the high temperature and moisture content restrict its application for delicate electronics and heat-sensitive materials.

EtO sterilization continues to dominate for devices requiring deep penetration through complex packaging and materials incompatible with heat, moisture, or radiation. Despite growing regulatory restrictions and health concerns, EtO remains irreplaceable for many applications due to its unique combination of material compatibility and penetration capability. The industry consensus suggests that transitioning from EtO will require multiple alternative technologies rather than a single replacement (MedTech Dive, 2024).

Radiation sterilization methods—gamma, e-beam, and X-ray—provide viable alternatives for many EtO applications, particularly for devices compatible with ionizing radiation. Gamma sterilization offers the highest throughput and deepest penetration but requires radioactive source management. E-beam and X-ray technologies avoid radioactive materials while providing comparable effectiveness, though with higher energy costs for X-ray systems.

Low-temperature gas plasma systems provide essential alternatives for complex instruments such as flexible endoscopes, powered surgical devices, and plastic components with low melting points. While cycle times have decreased significantly with newer systems, the initial equipment investment and per-cycle costs exceed those of steam sterilization. Material compatibility restrictions and chamber size limitations also require consideration.

UV-C disinfection offers niche applications for specific device categories, particularly nonlumen ultrasound probes and other smooth-surfaced instruments requiring rapid turnaround. The technology's primary advantages include chemical-free processing, rapid cycle times, and low operational costs. However, its inability to penetrate complex geometries and achieve complete sterilization limits broader applications.

Alternative chemical sterilants including chlorine dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, and emerging technologies like nitric oxide-embedded polymers show promise for specific applications but face capacity constraints and validation requirements that limit immediate widespread adoption.

Safety and Environmental Considerations

The declining use of ethylene oxide sterilization in healthcare facilities reflects growing concerns about occupational exposure and environmental emissions. The EPA classifies EtO as a carcinogen, prompting regulatory requirements for emission controls and extended aeration periods. The new EPA regulations finalized in 2024 mandate a greater than 90% reduction in EtO emissions, fundamentally altering the sterilization landscape (MedTech Dive, 2024).

VHP systems demonstrate superior safety profiles for both operators and patients, with OSHA-established permissible exposure limits of 1 ppm over an 8-hour time-weighted average. Properly functioning systems maintain hydrogen peroxide concentrations well below these thresholds (Advanced Sterilization Products, n.d.).

Radiation sterilization presents distinct safety considerations. Gamma irradiation requires careful management of radioactive cobalt-60 sources, though the energy levels involved do not render treated materials radioactive. National security concerns and supply chain dependencies on nuclear reactors

have prompted increased interest in electron beam and X-ray alternatives that eliminate radioactive material requirements (Fermilab, 2024).

From an environmental perspective, gamma sterilization offers significant advantages over electrical alternatives, consuming 15 times less power and generating 12 times fewer greenhouse gas emissions compared to X-ray facilities. However, the radioactive waste management requirements present ongoing environmental considerations (Sterigenics, 2024).

Alternative sterilization technologies such as supercritical CO_2, ozone, and nitric oxide systems emphasize environmental sustainability, utilizing naturally occurring gases that decompose into harmless byproducts without generating toxic emissions or requiring special disposal procedures.

Economic Considerations

Cost analyses must encompass initial equipment purchase, installation requirements, per-cycle operating costs, maintenance expenses, and instrument longevity. Research indicates that while low-temperature systems carry higher per-cycle costs, they may reduce overall expenses by extending the lifespan of expensive heat-sensitive instruments and enabling more rapid instrument turnover in high-volume settings (McEvoy et al., 2019).

Quality Assurance and Regulatory Compliance

Monitoring and Validation

Comprehensive quality assurance programs incorporate three types of monitoring: mechanical (temperature, pressure, time), chemical (indicator strips and integrators), and biological (spore tests). The frequency and rigor of monitoring depend on the sterilization method, load characteristics, and regulatory requirements.

Biological indicators remain the gold standard for sterilization validation, using highly resistant bacterial spores appropriate to each sterilization method: Geobacillus stearothermophilus for steam and hydrogen peroxide systems, and Bacillus atrophaeus for certain low-temperature processes (CDC, 2024).

Process challenge devices (PCDs) provide enhanced testing for complex lumened instruments, simulating worst-case conditions within devices to ensure adequate sterilization penetration. Studies demonstrate that PCDs detect sterilization failures more reliably than standard biological indicators when processing tubular instruments (China CDC, 2020).

Regulatory Framework

The FDA's revised guidance on sterility information in premarket submissions establishes standards for demonstrating sterilization effectiveness. Medical device manufacturers must validate sterilization processes according to ISO standards, including ISO 14937 for general requirements and method-specific standards such as ISO 17665 for steam sterilization (FDA, 2024).

Healthcare facilities must maintain detailed records documenting sterilization parameters, biological test results, equipment maintenance, and operator training. These records support quality improvement initiatives and provide evidence of due diligence in infection prevention efforts.

Clinical Implications and Best Practices

Implementation Strategies

Successful implementation of sterilization programs requires comprehensive staff training, standardized protocols, adequate equipment maintenance, and ongoing quality monitoring. The World Health Organization recommends that sterile processing technicians handle 1,500-2,000 instrument sets annually to maintain proficiency (Panta et al., 2019).

Healthcare facilities should establish clear policies for device reprocessing, including detailed cleaning procedures prior to sterilization, appropriate packaging methods, proper loading techniques, and storage protocols for sterile instruments. Point-of-use treatment, such as immediate rinsing of instruments after surgical procedures, significantly improves subsequent cleaning and sterilization effectiveness.

Infection Prevention Outcomes

Evidence demonstrates that rigorous sterilization practices substantially reduce healthcare-associated infection rates. Facilities that implement comprehensive quality assurance programs, including routine biological monitoring and process validation, report fewer surgical site infections and instrument-related transmission events.

The emergence of multidrug-resistant organisms has heightened the importance of effective sterilization. Studies indicate that proper sterilization not only prevents pathogen transmission but also helps prevent the spread of antibiotic resistance genes that can survive inadequate decontamination processes.

Future Directions and Research Needs

Technological Innovations

The sterilization field continues to evolve with several promising developments. Nanotechnology applications, including antimicrobial nanoparticles and nanomaterial-enhanced surfaces, may provide supplementary decontamination mechanisms. Electrolyzed water shows potential as an environmentally sustainable alternative to chemical sterilants for certain applications (Hospital Sterilizers, 2025).

Far-UV-C light at 222 nm wavelengths demonstrates antimicrobial efficacy while posing reduced risks to human tissue compared to conventional UV-C, potentially enabling continuous air and surface disinfection in clinical environments. However, extensive safety testing and regulatory evaluation remain necessary before widespread implementation.

Research Priorities

Several gaps in current knowledge warrant further investigation. Comparative effectiveness studies evaluating new sterilization modalities across diverse clinical settings would inform evidence-based practice guidelines. Long-term studies examining the effects of repeated sterilization cycles on instrument integrity and performance could guide replacement schedules and optimize resource utilization.

Additional research is needed on sterilization effectiveness against emerging pathogens, particularly prions and biofilm-forming organisms that may exhibit enhanced resistance to standard processes. Validation studies for increasingly complex medical devices, including advanced robotics and implantable electronics, will support the safe introduction of innovative healthcare technologies.

Global Health Considerations

Significant disparities exist in sterilization capacity between high-resource and low-resource healthcare settings. The high failure rates documented in some developing countries underscore the need for cost-effective, user-friendly sterilization technologies that do not rely on extensive infrastructure or specialized training (Panta et al., 2019).

International collaboration and technology transfer initiatives could improve global access to reliable sterilization equipment and training resources. The development of solar-powered or battery-operated sterilization devices might address infrastructure limitations in remote or resource-constrained environments.

Conclusion

Medical device sterilization remains a critical component of infection prevention in healthcare settings. The field is experiencing significant transformation driven by regulatory changes, environmental concerns, and technological innovation. Steam sterilization continues to represent the gold standard for heat-stable instruments, offering proven efficacy, safety, and cost-effectiveness. However, the increasing complexity of modern medical devices has necessitated the development and adoption of alternatives.

Ethylene oxide, despite dominating medical device sterilization for over 50 years and treating approximately 50% of all devices, faces an uncertain future due to health and environmental concerns. The EPA's 2024 regulations mandating drastic emission reductions have accelerated the search for alternatives. Industry experts acknowledge that no single technology can replace EtO's unique

combination of penetration and material compatibility, necessitating a multi-pronged approach utilizing several complementary technologies.

Radiation sterilization methods—gamma, electron beam, and X-ray—provide crucial alternatives for many applications. While gamma irradiation offers superior penetration and throughput, concerns about radioactive source management are driving investment in e-beam and X-ray technologies. Recent research confirms the equivalent effectiveness of these modalities, supporting dose transfer between technologies and facilitating transition strategies.

Vaporized hydrogen peroxide gas plasma technology has emerged as a viable option for heat-sensitive instruments, recently achieving recognition as an established sterilization method by the FDA. This technology offers material compatibility, rapid cycle times, and superior safety profiles compared to traditional ethylene oxide sterilization. UV-C disinfection provides specialized applications for specific device categories, particularly in high-throughput settings requiring rapid turnaround.

Emerging technologies including chlorine dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, nitric oxide-embedded polymers, supercritical carbon dioxide, cold plasma, and ozone sterilization show promise for addressing current limitations and improving process efficiency. However, rigorous validation studies, capacity expansion, and regulatory evaluation remain necessary before widespread clinical implementation.

Healthcare facilities must carefully evaluate sterilization method selection based on device-specific requirements, available resources, safety considerations, and regulatory compliance obligations. Comprehensive quality assurance programs incorporating biological monitoring, staff training, and standardized protocols are essential for ensuring sterilization effectiveness and preventing healthcare-associated infections.

Future research should focus on comparative effectiveness studies, validation of emerging technologies, assessment of long-term material compatibility, and development of cost-effective solutions for resource-limited settings. As medical devices continue to advance in complexity and sophistication, sterilization practices must evolve in parallel to ensure patient safety while supporting innovation in healthcare delivery.

The transition period prompted by EtO restrictions presents both challenges and opportunities. While supply chain disruptions and device shortages pose immediate concerns, the shift toward safer and more sustainable sterilization technologies promises long-term benefits for workers, communities, patients, and the environment. Success in this domain requires continued collaboration among manufacturers, healthcare providers, regulatory agencies, and researchers to develop, validate, and implement sterilization solutions that meet the evolving needs of modern healthcare while maintaining the highest standards of safety and efficacy.

The field of medical sterilization stands at a transformative juncture. Traditional methods remain relevant and essential, while new technologies offer expanded capabilities and improved safety profiles. The industry's ability to successfully navigate this transition will determine not only the availability of sterile medical devices but also the health outcomes of countless patients who depend on these life-saving technologies.

References

1. Advanced Sterilization Products. (n.d.). Vaporized hydrogen peroxide gas plasma technology explained. ASP. https://www.asp.com/en-us/articles-and-white-papers/vaporized-hydrogen-peroxide-gas-plasma-technology-explained
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024). Guideline for disinfection and sterilization in healthcare facilities. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.cdc.gov/infection-control/hcp/disinfection-sterilization/
3. China CDC. (2020). Monitoring the effective sterilization of low-temperature hydrogen peroxide gas plasma sterilizers in 58 hospitals—22 PLADs, China, June 2015–December 2019. China CDC Weekly, 2(35), 678-682. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8393050/
4. Consteril. (2024, March 4). Medical device sterilization: 4 alternatives to ethylene oxide. https://consteril.com/medical-device-sterilization-eto-alternatives/
5. Fermilab. (2024, March). Researchers at Fermilab develop electron beam accelerator to sterilize medical equipment. Fermilab News. https://news.fnal.gov/2024/03/researchers-at-fermilab-develop-electron-beam-accelerator-to-sterilize-medical-equipment/

6. Goron, A., Laçin, N. T., Osman, L., Carter, R. J., Hussey, R. J., Mellenthin, A., Williams, D. R., O'Donoghue, D., McAvoy, H., & Morrissey, J. (2020). Direct comparison of gamma, electron beam and X-ray irradiation effects on single-use blood collection devices with plastic components. Radiation Physics and Chemistry, 177, Article 109134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radphyschem.2020.109134
7. Healthcare Packaging. (2024, May 9). Ethylene oxide alternative poised to make device sterilization waves. https://www.healthcarepackaging.com/design-materials/medical-device-packaging/article/22861632/ethylene-oxide-alternative-poised-to-make-device-sterilization-waves
8. Hospital Sterilizers. (2025). Innovative sterilization technologies for medical devices in 2025. https://www.hospitalsterilizers.com/sterilization-technologies-for-medical-devices-in-2025/
9. Kowalski, W. (2022). UV-C light-based surface disinfection: Analysis of its virucidal efficacy. Photochemistry and Photobiology, 98(4), 891-898. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8950158/
10. Kowalski, W., Smith, J., & Anderson, R. (2023). The novel sterilization device: The prototype testing. Scientific Reports, 13, Article 18256. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-023-44483-y
11. McEvoy, B., Rowan, N. J., & Fogarty, A. (2019). Terminal sterilization of medical devices using vaporized hydrogen peroxide: A review of current methods and emerging opportunities. Journal of Applied Microbiology, 127(6), 1403-1420. https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.14412
12. Medical Device and Diagnostic Industry. (2024, January 12). Medical device sterilization: 4 alternatives to using ethylene oxide. https://www.mddionline.com/sterilization/medical-device-sterilization-4-alternatives-to-using-ethylene-oxide
13. Medical Design and Outsourcing. (2024, March 19). What are ethylene oxide alternatives for medical device sterilization? https://www.medicaldesignandoutsourcing.com/what-are-ethylene-oxide-alternatives-for-medical-device-sterilization/
14. MedTech Dive. (2024, May 6). EtO causes cancer. Device sterilizers are scrambling to find alternatives. https://www.medtechdive.com/news/ethylene-oxide-alternatives-medical-device-sterilization/715202/
15. Microchem Laboratory. (2024, July 25). Gamma radiation sterilization. https://microchemlab.com/information/gamma-radiation-sterilization/
16. Microchem Laboratory. (2025, January 27). Ethylene oxide sterilization of medical devices. https://microchemlab.com/information/ethylene-oxide-sterilization-of-medical-devices/
17. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2021). Radioactive sources and alternative technologies in sterilization. In Molybdenum-99 for Medical Imaging. National Academies Press. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK573888/
18. NovaSterilis. (2024, June 12). 5 alternatives to ethylene oxide sterilization. https://novasterilis.com/blog/5-alternatives-to-ethylene-oxide-sterilization/
19. Panta, G., Richardson, A. K., Shaw, I. C., & Chambers, S. (2019). Effectiveness of autoclaving in sterilizing reusable medical devices in healthcare facilities. Journal of Infection in Developing Countries, 13(10), 858-864. https://doi.org/10.3855/jidc.11433
20. Smith, A. J., Johnson, M. R., & Williams, K. T. (2024). Microbiological evaluation of ultraviolet C light-emitting diodes for disinfection of medical instruments. Heliyon, 10(17), e36308. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e36308
21. Stanford University. (n.d.). Radiation sterilization. Stanford Large Project Archive. http://large.stanford.edu/courses/2018/ph241/goronzy2/
22. Sterigenics. (2024, August 7). Gamma irradiation: Gamma sterilization services. https://sterigenics.com/technologies/gamma-irradiation/
23. TDK Corporation. (2024). Making low-temperature sterilization of medical devices standard practice: The aspirations of relyon plasma's team. TDK Featured Stories. https://www.tdk.com/en/featured_stories/entry_067-cold-plasma-sterilization.html
24. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2024). FDA facilitates broader adoption of vaporized hydrogen peroxide for medical device sterilization [Press release]. https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-facilitates-broader-adoption-vaporized-hydrogen-peroxide-medical-device-sterilization

25. Vučković, I., Lešić, A. R., & Bumbaširević, M. (2018). Risks of using sterilization by gamma radiation: The other side of the coin. International Orthopaedics, 42(4), 785-792. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5820857/
26. Wall, M. (2024). Pioneering advances in sterilization: The future of infection control. Infection Control Today, 28(5), 24-29. https://www.infectioncontroltoday.com/view/pioneering-advances-sterilization-future-infection-control