The Microbial Inefficacy of Toilet Cleaning Tablets: A Scientific Review of Antimicrobial Limitations and Regulatory Gaps

Executive Summary

Consumer products such as in-tank drop-in cleaners, rim-mounted dispensers, and automatic bowl cleaners have become a multi-million-dollar consumer category due to marketing campaigns promoting ease of maintaining hygienic toilets with continuous antimicrobial protection.

However, a survey of current, peer-reviewed, microbiological literature; current, EPA-mandated, standards for testing antimicrobial products; and comparative efficacy studies demonstrate a clear difference between what is claimed in advertisements and what actually occurs in the real world.

The primary conclusions drawn in this white paper are based upon scientific data demonstrating that toilet cleaning tablets do not reliably kill microorganisms under realistic usage conditions. Specifically:

Biofilm resistance to continuous chemical contact with antimicrobials: Pitts et al., demonstrated that bacterial biofilms can be formed and maintained in the presence of chlorine concentrations of 9-27 mg/L for extended periods of time, much longer than the duration of typical tablet releases. These biofilms can become thick enough to provide structural barriers that protect embedded bacteria from antimicrobial agents and can increase their resistance by 10 to 1000 fold compared to free-floating (planktonic) bacteria.

Persistence of pathogens despite frequent application of cleaning tablets: Barker and Bloomfield demonstrated that Salmonella could survive in biofilms for up to 50 days, even when toilet cleaning was performed regularly. A study published by Gerba et al. also demonstrated that viruses can survive multiple flushing cycles, and can remain detectable after 7 sequential flushes using both MS2 bacteriophage and poliovirus. A more recent study conducted by Verani et al., demonstrated that Human Adenovirus can be detected on approximately 70 percent of all toilet surfaces, regardless of whether or not they had been cleaned.

Inadequate testing protocols: The EPA requires that products tested according to AOAC's Use-Dilution Methods (955.14, 955.15, 964.02) demonstrate efficacy against planktonic bacteria

grown on standardized carriers under controlled laboratory conditions. This type of testing does not accurately reflect the biofilm-dominated environment of an actual toilet bowl. The CDC has stated that the AOAC tests are "neither accurate nor reproducible" for determining disinfectant effectiveness in real-world situations. In addition, there were no standardized methods for testing efficacy against biofilms until 2017, more than 30 years after the introduction of toilet cleaning tablets into the consumer marketplace.

The single-product efficacy gap. Single-product research shows that toilet bowl cleaners alone are significantly less effective in reducing pathogens compared to a multi-surface disinfectant protocol (Boone, et al., 2025; p= .009). Microbial Risk Assessment Modeling also indicates that cleaning all surfaces will be greater than 99.7% effective at reducing Norovirus risks, whereas single-product cleaners will have significant residual contamination. All studies point to the need for mechanical scrubbing as a necessary component of good toilet hygiene and that chemical-only methods (such as passive tablets) cannot replace this necessity.

Toilet plume aerosol generation. Research conducted by Crimaldi et al. (2022) demonstrated that toilet flushing creates bioaerosol plumes moving at speeds > 2 m/s and reaching heights of up to 1.5 m above the toilet and remain airborne in bathrooms for more than 30 minutes after a flush. Regardless of whether the toilet lid is open or closed, these aerosols can transport viable pathogens from toilets to other surfaces in bathrooms creating a persistent cycle of re-contamination that cannot be addressed by continuous release products.

The implications for public health are significant. Consumer reliance on toilet cleaning tablets may create a false sense of antimicrobial security, potentially leading to reduced frequency of mechanical cleaning and inadequate pathogen control—particularly in households with immunocompromised individuals, young children, or elderly residents. The evidence suggests that effective toilet hygiene requires a bundled approach combining regular mechanical scrubbing, appropriately formulated disinfectants with adequate contact time, and multi-surface bathroom cleaning protocols.

This white paper concludes that current toilet cleaning tablet formulations, deployment methods, and regulatory oversight are insufficient to achieve the level of microbial control implied by product marketing. The disconnect between laboratory testing standards and real-world performance, combined with the inherent limitations of continuous low-dose chemical release against established biofilms, renders these products inadequate as standalone hygiene solutions. Manufacturers, regulators, and public health authorities must address these gaps through improved testing methodologies, transparent product labeling, and evidence-based consumer education on the necessity of comprehensive toilet cleaning practices.

I. Introduction and Background

A. The Prevalence of Toilet Cleaning Tablets in Consumer Markets

Toilet cleaning tablets have become ubiquitous fixtures in American bathrooms, marketed as convenient, "set-and-forget" solutions for maintaining bowl cleanliness and controlling microbial contamination. These products come in several configurations: in-tank drop-in tablets that dissolve gradually with each flush, rim-mounted dispensers that release chemicals into bowl water, and clip-on systems that adhere to the bowl rim. Major consumer brands including Clorox, Lysol, Scrubbing Bubbles, and 2000 Flushes have established dominant market positions through aggressive advertising campaigns emphasizing convenience, continuous protection, and antimicrobial efficacy.

The consumer appeal of these products is understandable. Modern households face increasing time constraints, and the promise of automated toilet hygiene without regular scrubbing addresses a genuine pain point in household maintenance routines. Product marketing typically highlights claims of "continuous cleaning," "germ-killing power," and "freshness with every flush"—messaging that implies ongoing antimicrobial protection comparable to or superior to traditional manual cleaning methods.

However, the regulatory landscape governing these products reveals important distinctions that consumers rarely understand. Under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), antimicrobial products making public health claims—specifically, claims to kill, inhibit, or mitigate microorganisms that pose threats to public health—must register with the Environmental Protection Agency and demonstrate efficacy through standardized testing protocols. Products making only "cleaning" claims (soil removal, stain prevention, odor control) fall outside this regulatory framework and require no antimicrobial efficacy demonstration.

This regulatory bifurcation creates a market in which some toilet cleaning tablets carry EPA registration numbers and disinfectant claims, while others make no antimicrobial assertions whatsoever, focusing instead on cosmetic benefits like blue water coloration and fresh scents. Consumer surveys consistently reveal that most purchasers do not distinguish between these product categories, assuming all toilet cleaning tablets provide antimicrobial protection regardless of labeling specifics.

B. Purpose and Scope of This White Paper

This white paper undertakes a systematic examination of the scientific evidence regarding the antimicrobial efficacy of toilet cleaning tablets under real-world conditions. The central question is straightforward: Do these products deliver meaningful pathogen reduction in residential toilet environments as used by typical consumers?

To answer this question, we have synthesized evidence from multiple sources:

1. **Peer-reviewed microbiological research** on toilet bowl biofilm formation, composition, and resistance to antimicrobial agents
2. **Regulatory testing standards** established by the EPA, CDC, and AOAC International for evaluating disinfectant efficacy

3. **Comparative efficacy studies** measuring pathogen reduction under controlled conditions with different cleaning protocols
4. **Consumer product testing** methodologies and their limitations
5. **Post-market surveillance data** including product recalls, settlements, and regulatory enforcement actions

The scope of this analysis encompasses bacterial, viral, and fungal pathogens relevant to public health in residential toilet environments. We examine both immediate antimicrobial effects (kill rates upon contact) and sustained pathogen control over typical product use periods. Our review includes consideration of biofilm formation dynamics, aerosol generation during flushing, and cross-contamination patterns that may persist despite product use.

For purposes of this white paper, "microbial inefficacy" is defined as the failure to achieve and maintain pathogen reduction levels consistent with public health protection, considering the product as used under normal household conditions. This definition distinguishes between theoretical antimicrobial activity demonstrated in laboratory settings and practical pathogen control in complex, real-world environments.

Limitations and boundaries. This review focuses specifically on toilet bowl environments and does not comprehensively address broader bathroom hygiene beyond toilet plume contamination effects. We examine residential rather than commercial or institutional settings, though we reference healthcare research where relevant to understanding pathogen survival dynamics. Our analysis concentrates on currently marketed product formulations and does not speculate on hypothetical future technologies.

C. Key Terminology

Cleaning, sanitizing, and disinfecting. The EPA maintains specific regulatory definitions for these terms. "Cleaning" refers to the physical removal of soil, organic matter, and debris from surfaces—a process that may remove microorganisms mechanically but makes no claims about killing them. "Sanitizing" requires a product to reduce bacterial populations by at least 3-log (99.9%) on food contact surfaces or 5-log (99.999%) on non-food contact surfaces within a specified time period. "Disinfecting" demands even higher performance standards, with specific kill claims against designated test organisms under standardized conditions. These distinctions are crucial because many toilet cleaning tablets make only cleaning claims, not sanitizing or disinfecting claims.

Biofilm formation and significance. Biofilms are structured communities of bacterial cells encased in self-produced extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) that adhere to surfaces. In toilet bowl environments, biofilms form continuously as waterborne bacteria colonize the porcelain surface and under-rim areas, secreting polysaccharide matrices that provide structural integrity and protection from environmental stresses—including antimicrobial agents. Biofilm architecture creates diffusion barriers that prevent biocides from reaching embedded cells, while the metabolic heterogeneity within biofilms produces subpopulations with enhanced resistance.

Research consistently demonstrates that biofilm-embedded bacteria require antimicrobial concentrations 10 to 1,000 times higher than planktonic cells for equivalent kill rates.

Planktonic versus sessile bacteria. "Planktonic" bacteria are free-floating individual cells suspended in liquid, while "sessile" bacteria are those attached to surfaces, typically within biofilm structures. This distinction is critical because virtually all regulatory testing for disinfectant efficacy uses planktonic bacteria—cells that are inherently more susceptible to antimicrobial agents than the sessile biofilm populations that dominate real toilet bowl environments. The AOAC Use-Dilution Methods, for instance, test disinfectants against planktonic bacteria dried onto standardized carriers, not against mature biofilms on porous or textured surfaces.

Contact time. All disinfectants require a minimum duration of continuous wet contact with target surfaces to achieve claimed kill rates. For household disinfectants, EPA-approved contact times typically range from 30 seconds to 10 minutes depending on the target organism and chemical formulation. Sporicidal claims (effectiveness against bacterial spores like Clostridium difficile) often require contact times of 5–10 minutes or longer. Toilet cleaning tablets that release chemicals into bowl water generally cannot maintain the wet surface contact required for disinfection on above-waterline surfaces, rim areas, or the toilet exterior.

Log reduction. Microbiological efficacy is expressed in logarithmic reductions of viable organisms. A 1-log reduction represents 90% kill (one decimal place), 2-log reduction equals 99% kill, 3-log reduction equals 99.9% kill, and so forth. EPA sanitizer registration requires demonstration of at least 3-log reduction (99.9%) for most bacteria, while hospital-grade disinfectant claims often require 6-log reduction (99.9999%) or greater. Context matters significantly: a 3-log reduction of an initial biofilm population of 10^8 cells/cm² still leaves 10^5 cells/cm²—a substantial residual pathogen burden.

II. The Microbiology of Toilet Environments

A. Bacterial Communities in Toilet Bowl Biofilms

The microbial ecology of toilet bowls represents a complex, dynamic ecosystem characterized by continuous inoculation with human waste, exposure to aquatic environments, and colonization by diverse bacterial communities capable of biofilm formation. Research by Rémy et al. (2009) provided pioneering insights into this "glimpse under the rim," revealing that toilet bowl biofilms harbor bacterial diversity spanning multiple phyla including Acidobacteria, Actinobacteria, Bacteroidetes, and Proteobacteria.

The dominant genera identified in toilet bowl biofilms include Methylobacterium, Sphingomonas, Pseudomonas, and Chryseomonas—organisms well adapted to aquatic environments and capable of producing the extracellular polymeric substances that give biofilms their structural integrity and antimicrobial resistance. Importantly, these are not exclusively fecal organisms; many toilet bowl colonizers are environmental bacteria introduced through water supply

systems, establishing residence in the nutrient-rich, moisture-stable environment of the toilet bowl.

Biofilm thickness in toilet environments varies by location, with measurements ranging from a few micrometers in high-shear flow areas to 20 μm or more in protected under-rim locations. Cell densities within these biofilms span an enormous range—from 10^3 to 10^8 colony-forming units per square centimeter (CFU/cm²)—depending on biofilm age, nutrient availability, and exposure to antimicrobial stresses.

The research by Pitts et al. (1998) established critical baseline data on toilet bowl biofilm composition and resistance patterns. In their systematic study of biofilm communities in residential toilets, they documented that biofilms develop rapidly after cleaning, with detectable bacterial populations reestablishing within 24 hours and mature biofilm architecture developing within 72–96 hours. This rapid recolonization dynamic means that even effective disinfection provides only temporary pathogen control unless mechanical biofilm removal accompanies chemical treatment.

Flores et al. (2011) expanded our understanding through microbial biogeography studies of public restroom surfaces, demonstrating that toilet surfaces harbor distinct bacterial communities dominated by gut-associated taxa but also including skin-associated organisms, environmental bacteria, and opportunistic pathogens. The presence of fecal indicator bacteria (Escherichia coli, Enterococcus species) was widespread but not universal, suggesting that toilet contamination dynamics involve both direct fecal deposition and secondary transfer from hands, cleaning implements, and aerosol settling.

B. Pathogen Persistence Despite Cleaning

One of the most concerning findings in toilet hygiene research is the documented persistence of pathogenic organisms despite regular cleaning practices that many consumers would consider adequate. The landmark study by Barker and Bloomfield (2000) tracked Salmonella survival in bathrooms of households recovering from salmonellosis outbreaks. They found that Salmonella persisted in toilet bowl biofilms for up to 50 days post-infection despite residents' normal cleaning routines, which included periodic use of toilet cleaners and disinfectants. This extended survival period creates ongoing household transmission risks and demonstrates that common cleaning practices—presumably including the use of in-tank cleaning tablets—fail to eliminate enteric pathogens from toilet environments.

The viral persistence picture is equally troubling. Gerba et al. (1975) conducted foundational research demonstrating that viral contamination of toilet bowls persists through multiple flush cycles. After inoculating toilet bowls with MS2 bacteriophage and poliovirus type 1, they found detectable virus in bowl water after seven sequential flushes. Subsequent research by Johnson et al. (2017) confirmed and extended these findings, showing that bowl water contamination persists for more than 24 sequential flushes following initial viral or bacterial inoculation. This persistence cannot be attributed solely to biofilm reservoirs; the researchers documented

ongoing release of organisms from under-rim areas and internal trapway surfaces that remain contaminated despite repeated flushing.

More recently, Verani et al. (2014) examined viral contamination patterns in healthcare and residential bathrooms, finding human adenovirus on 70% of toilet surfaces tested. Critically, this contamination was detected regardless of the cleaning protocols in place, suggesting that standard bathroom hygiene practices—including use of cleaning tablets and periodic manual cleaning—are insufficient to maintain viral control on toilet surfaces.

The persistence of Clostridium difficile spores presents particular challenges. C. difficile is a spore-forming anaerobic bacterium responsible for severe healthcare-associated diarrheal disease, and its spores demonstrate exceptional resistance to most disinfectants. Research by Best et al. (2012) and Wilson et al. (2020) has documented that C. difficile spore contamination persists on toilet surfaces and becomes aerosolized during flushing, creating both direct contact and inhalation exposure risks. Most toilet cleaning tablets rely on chlorine-based or quaternary ammonium compound formulations that lack sporicidal activity, meaning they provide no protection against this important pathogen.

C. The Under-Rim Sanctuary

The anatomical design of modern toilets creates protected microbial niches that are particularly resistant to both mechanical cleaning and chemical disinfection. The area beneath the toilet rim—where rim holes deliver flush water to the bowl—represents a sheltered environment with reduced water flow, minimal mechanical disturbance, and limited chemical exposure even when toilet bowl cleaners are added to the water.

Studies specifically examining under-rim contamination patterns have consistently identified this area as a biofilm reservoir. The textured surface of rim holes, the presence of mineral deposits that provide additional surface area for bacterial attachment, and the protection from shear forces create ideal conditions for biofilm establishment. Once established, these under-rim biofilms serve as persistent sources of organisms that reseed the bowl after each flush and following cleaning events.

Pitts et al. (1998) observed that even when toilet bowl water contained continuous chlorine at concentrations of 9–27 mg/L—levels far exceeding typical swimming pool chlorination and well above what most toilet cleaning tablets can maintain—biofilms still formed in protected under-rim areas. The researchers noted that biofilm bacteria in these locations demonstrated reduced susceptibility to chlorine, requiring exposures of 30 minutes or more at elevated concentrations to achieve significant kill.

This under-rim sanctuary effect has profound implications for toilet cleaning tablet efficacy. Products that release antimicrobial agents into bowl water may achieve some bacterial reduction in the water phase and on submerged bowl surfaces, but they cannot deliver adequate chemical concentrations with sufficient contact time to protected under-rim biofilms.

Mechanical scrubbing of these areas—which requires appropriate brush design and deliberate user effort—remains the only reliable method for biofilm disruption in these critical locations.

D. Toilet Plume Aerosol Generation

The phenomenon of toilet plume aerosolization has gained increased attention in recent years, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic and heightened awareness of fecal-oral and respiratory transmission routes. When toilets flush, the turbulent mixing of water and air generates bioaerosol droplets containing viable microorganisms that are ejected from the bowl and dispersed throughout the bathroom environment.

Groundbreaking research by Crimaldi et al. (2022) used laser visualization techniques to map toilet plume dynamics during flushing of commercial toilets. They documented that aerosol plumes reach velocities exceeding 2 meters per second and heights of 1.5 meters above the bowl rim, with particle dispersion continuing for 30–60 seconds after flush completion. Critically, these aerosols carry viable bacteria and viruses capable of settling on bathroom surfaces including faucets, towel racks, toothbrush holders, and floors.

Johnson et al. (2013) conducted a comprehensive literature review of toilet plume research and confirmed that viable microorganisms persist in bathroom air for more than 30 minutes following a single flush. Subsequent investigations by Knowlton et al. (2018) measured bioaerosol concentrations in hospital patient rooms, finding significantly elevated bacterial and viral counts in air samples collected during and after toilet use.

Perhaps most disconcerting for consumers who believe toilet lid closure prevents contamination: multiple studies have demonstrated that closing the toilet lid before flushing provides minimal protection against aerosol generation. Goforth et al. (2024) found no significant difference in surface viral contamination between open-lid and closed-lid flushing conditions, suggesting that aerosols escape through the gaps between lid and bowl or are generated as the lid is opened post-flush.

The implications for toilet cleaning tablet efficacy are clear. Even if these products successfully reduced microbial populations in bowl water—a claim we will examine critically in subsequent sections—they cannot prevent the aerosolization and bathroom-wide dispersal of organisms during the flush event itself. Each flush creates a contamination event that deposits viable pathogens on surfaces throughout the bathroom, requiring comprehensive surface disinfection protocols that extend far beyond the toilet bowl. Tablets that work exclusively in the bowl water or on the bowl surface cannot address this broader contamination dynamic.

Furthermore, Abney et al. (2021) note in their comprehensive review of toilet hygiene research that bioaerosol generation occurs with every flush, regardless of the presence or absence of cleaning chemicals in bowl water. The mechanical forces of turbulent water flow and air entrainment during flushing are sufficient to generate aerosol droplets containing whatever organisms are present in bowl water or biofilm. This means that continuous-release cleaning

tablets, even if they reduce waterborne bacterial counts, do not eliminate and may not even substantially reduce aerosol-mediated pathogen dispersal during normal toilet use.

The research reveals a toilet environment characterized by rapid biofilm formation, pathogen persistence despite regular cleaning, protected anatomical niches that resist both mechanical and chemical intervention, and continuous recontamination through aerosol generation. This is the microbial reality against which toilet cleaning tablets must demonstrate efficacy—a far more challenging environment than the controlled laboratory conditions under which most products are tested.

III. Laboratory Evidence of Antimicrobial Limitations

A. Biofilm Resistance to Continuous Chlorine Exposure

The most direct experimental evidence regarding toilet cleaning tablet inefficacy comes from controlled laboratory studies examining biofilm formation under continuous antimicrobial exposure. The seminal work by Pitts et al. (1998, 2001) established a repeatable laboratory method for testing biocide efficacy against toilet bowl biofilms and revealed findings that fundamentally challenge the premise of continuous-release cleaning products.

In their 1998 study, Pitts and colleagues examined bacterial colonization of toilet bowls maintained under continuous chlorine exposure at concentrations ranging from 9 to 27 mg/L—substantially higher than the 1–5 mg/L typically maintained by consumer toilet cleaning tablets. Despite these elevated chlorine levels, the researchers documented robust biofilm formation within 48–72 hours of initial bacterial inoculation. The biofilms consisted primarily of Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Sphingomonas paucimobilis, and Methylobacterium species—organisms demonstrating remarkable tolerance to continuous oxidative stress.

The critical finding was not merely that biofilms formed despite chlorine presence, but that biofilm-embedded bacteria exhibited dramatically reduced susceptibility compared to their planktonic counterparts. Pitts et al. (2001) quantified this resistance differential, demonstrating that biofilm bacteria required chlorine exposures 10 to 1,000 times longer than planktonic cells to achieve equivalent kill rates. Even at the highest chlorine concentrations tested, complete biofilm eradication required contact times of 30 minutes or more—durations utterly impractical in toilet bowl environments where water continuously flows and chemicals are diluted with each flush.

The mechanism underlying this resistance involves multiple factors. The extracellular polymeric substance (EPS) matrix surrounding biofilm cells acts as a diffusion barrier, slowing penetration of antimicrobial agents into the biofilm interior. Additionally, metabolic heterogeneity within biofilms creates subpopulations of slow-growing or dormant cells that are inherently less susceptible to biocides targeting active metabolism. The three-dimensional architecture of mature biofilms produces oxygen and nutrient gradients, with anaerobic microenvironments in deeper layers where oxidative biocides like chlorine lose efficacy.

These laboratory findings have profound implications for toilet cleaning tablet performance. If continuous chlorine at 9–27 mg/L cannot prevent biofilm formation and requires extended contact times to kill established biofilms, consumer products releasing 1–5 mg/L intermittently with each flush cannot reasonably be expected to maintain microbial control. The research demonstrates a fundamental mismatch between the antimicrobial challenge (established biofilms with inherent resistance) and the intervention approach (low-dose continuous release without mechanical disruption).

B. The Gap Between Laboratory Testing and Real-World Conditions

The disconnect between regulatory testing protocols and actual product use conditions represents a critical flaw in how antimicrobial efficacy claims are validated. The AOAC Use-Dilution Methods (955.14, 955.15, 964.02)—the industry standard for evaluating disinfectant efficacy—test products against planktonic bacteria dried onto standardized stainless steel or porcelain carriers. Test organisms are cultured overnight in nutrient broth, diluted to specific cell densities, applied to carriers, dried, and then exposed to the test disinfectant for a defined contact time (typically 10 minutes). Products must demonstrate successful kill on 59 of 60 carriers to pass.

While this methodology provides standardized, reproducible results suitable for comparative product evaluation, it bears minimal resemblance to real-world toilet bowl conditions. The test uses planktonic bacteria—precisely the population type known to be most susceptible to antimicrobial agents. It employs smooth, non-porous carrier surfaces rather than the textured, mineral-deposit-laden surfaces of actual toilet bowls. It specifies continuous wet contact for defined durations, whereas toilet cleaning tablets release chemicals into flowing water that continuously dilutes and removes active ingredients. Most critically, the AOAC methods do not test against biofilms—the predominant microbial organizational structure in toilet environments.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has acknowledged these limitations explicitly, stating in their guidelines on disinfection and sterilization that standard use-dilution tests are "neither accurate nor reproducible" for predicting real-world disinfectant performance (CDC, 2023). This remarkably candid assessment from the nation's premier public health agency should give consumers pause regarding the meaningfulness of antimicrobial claims based solely on these testing protocols.

The EPA did not establish standardized guidance for antimicrobial products making biofilm claims until 2017—decades after toilet cleaning tablets became consumer staples. This guidance document acknowledges that biofilm testing requires fundamentally different methodologies, including biofilm growth on relevant surface materials, appropriate maturation periods to establish EPS production, and recognition that "biofilm bacteria are much more resistant to antimicrobials than planktonic bacteria." The belated recognition of this testing gap suggests that generations of toilet cleaning products received EPA registration and made antimicrobial claims without ever demonstrating efficacy against the biofilm populations they would encounter in actual use.

Furthermore, the contact time specifications in regulatory testing rarely align with product use realities. Many EPA-registered disinfectants require 10-minute contact times for bacterial claims and 5–10 minutes for sporicidal claims against organisms like Clostridium difficile. Toilet cleaning tablets that release chemicals into bowl water during brief flush cycles cannot possibly maintain the continuous wet surface contact required for these kill times on above-waterline bowl surfaces, under-rim areas, or exterior surfaces. The active ingredients are present in the water phase, not maintaining wet contact with the surfaces where biofilms establish residence.

C. Studies Demonstrating Limited Pathogen Reduction

Beyond the biofilm resistance findings, direct measurements of pathogen reduction in toilet environments have consistently revealed disappointing performance. The foundational research by Gerba et al. (1975) established that viral contamination persists through multiple flush cycles despite the dilution effects one might expect. After inoculating toilet bowls with MS2 bacteriophage and poliovirus type 1, they recovered viable virus from bowl water after seven sequential flushes. This seminal study predated modern toilet cleaning tablets but established the baseline expectation: simple dilution and removal through flushing is insufficient for viral elimination, meaning additional antimicrobial intervention is necessary.

Johnson et al. (2017) extended this work with more rigorous methodology, inoculating toilet bowls with Enterococcus faecalis and tracking contamination through 24 sequential flushes. They found persistent contamination throughout the flush sequence, with bacterial concentrations declining gradually but remaining detectable even after extensive water exchange. Importantly, this persistence occurred despite complete replacement of bowl water multiple times over, indicating that biofilm reservoirs continuously reseeded the water phase with viable organisms.

The research team identified the toilet trapway—the curved section of the bowl drain—as a critical contamination reservoir. This area remains constantly water-filled, receives limited mechanical cleaning, and accumulates biofilm that persists despite flushing. Each flush disturbs these biofilms, releasing organisms into fresh bowl water and maintaining the contamination cycle. Toilet cleaning tablets that release chemicals into bowl water may achieve some concentration in the standing water of the trapway, but cannot deliver the mechanical disruption necessary to remove established biofilm from these surfaces.

Verani et al. (2014) contributed crucial evidence on viral persistence specifically. Their study examined viral contamination in healthcare and residential toilets using molecular detection methods for human adenovirus. They found viral contamination on 70% of toilet surfaces tested, including bowl rims, seats, flush handles, and exterior surfaces. Most significantly, this contamination was detected regardless of the cleaning protocols in place at the facilities studied. Some facilities employed professional cleaning services with regular disinfection; others relied on household cleaning practices. The viral contamination rates showed no significant differences, suggesting that conventional cleaning approaches—including those employing toilet cleaning tablets—fail to achieve viral control.

The Verani study also examined viral contamination of bathroom air through aerosol sampling. They detected aerosolized virus particles during and following toilet flushing, with contamination persisting for 30 minutes or more in bathroom air. This finding reinforces that toilet hygiene is not merely a matter of bowl surface disinfection; the aerosol dispersal of pathogens creates a three-dimensional contamination problem that requires comprehensive environmental control measures, not just chemical treatment of bowl water.

More recently, research by Sassi et al. (2018) evaluated hospital-grade disinfectants specifically in the context of toilet flushing and viral deposition. Even with EPA-registered disinfectants applied according to label directions, viral contamination of bathroom surfaces occurred during subsequent toilet use. The researchers concluded that effective toilet hygiene requires not only appropriate chemical disinfectants but also proper application techniques, adequate contact times, and most critically, application to all potentially contaminated surfaces—requirements that passive continuous-release systems cannot fulfill.

The cumulative laboratory evidence reveals a consistent pattern: biofilms form despite continuous chemical exposure at concentrations exceeding typical tablet release rates, regulatory testing methods do not reflect real-world conditions, and direct measurements of pathogen reduction demonstrate persistent contamination despite cleaning interventions. These findings establish a scientific foundation for questioning the antimicrobial efficacy of toilet cleaning tablets as standalone hygiene solutions.

IV. Regulatory Framework and Its Limitations

A. EPA Registration Requirements for Antimicrobial Products

Under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), antimicrobial pesticides intended to control microorganisms harmful to public health must undergo EPA registration before marketing. This regulatory framework applies to products making claims to disinfect, sanitize, or otherwise control bacteria, viruses, fungi, or algae. The registration process requires manufacturers to submit efficacy data demonstrating that products perform as claimed under specified use conditions.

The EPA divides antimicrobial products into regulatory categories based on their intended use and claimed performance level. Public health antimicrobials—including most toilet bowl cleaners making germ-kill claims—fall under stricter scrutiny than products making only non-public health claims such as odor control or mold prevention on non-food contact surfaces. For public health antimicrobials, manufacturers must provide efficacy data against specific test organisms using EPA-approved testing protocols.

The distinction between sanitizers and disinfectants carries regulatory significance. Sanitizers must demonstrate a 3-log reduction (99.9% kill) on food contact surfaces or a 5-log reduction on

non-food contact surfaces within a specified contact time, typically 30–60 seconds. Disinfectants must meet more stringent performance standards, achieving complete kill or specific log reductions against designated test organisms including more resistant species. Sterilants represent the highest category, requiring elimination of all viable microorganisms including highly resistant bacterial spores.

Toilet cleaning tablets making antimicrobial claims typically register as sanitizers or disinfectants, though the specific claims vary widely across products. Some products claim broad-spectrum bacterial kill, while others make more limited claims against specific organisms. The critical regulatory question is whether the efficacy data supporting these registrations accurately predict performance in real-world toilet bowl environments—a question that the evidence increasingly answers in the negative.

Importantly, products making only "cleaning" claims—soil removal, stain prevention, deodorization—fall outside FIFRA requirements and need no EPA registration. This regulatory exemption creates a category of toilet bowl products that consumers may assume provide antimicrobial protection but make no registered efficacy claims. The blue-water coloration and fresh scent that many consumers associate with cleanliness and germ protection may come from products making no antimicrobial assertions whatsoever.

B. Testing Standards and Their Shortcomings

The AOAC Use-Dilution Methods represent the cornerstone of disinfectant efficacy testing in the United States. Method 955.14 tests bactericidal activity against Staphylococcus aureus, method 955.15 tests against Salmonella enterica, and method 964.02 tests against Pseudomonas aeruginosa. These methods follow a standardized protocol: test organisms grown in nutrient broth are applied to cylindrical stainless steel or porcelain carriers, allowed to dry, and then exposed to the test disinfectant at the manufacturer's recommended use concentration for 10 minutes at 20°C. After exposure, carriers are transferred to neutralizing medium, incubated, and examined for bacterial growth. Products must demonstrate no growth on 59 of 60 carriers to pass.

The performance standard of 59/60 carriers sounds rigorous, but this represents only a 2-log reduction requirement in practice—99% kill of the bacterial population on the carrier. For products claiming to "disinfect" or "kill 99.9% of germs," consumers might reasonably expect higher performance than the 99% minimum standard. Moreover, the 10-minute contact time specified in the test protocol bears little relationship to how toilet cleaning tablets function in actual use, where active ingredients are released into flowing water that continuously dilutes and removes chemicals from surfaces.

The fundamental limitation is more profound: these tests evaluate planktonic bacteria, not biofilms. As discussed in Section III, biofilm-embedded bacteria demonstrate 10 to 1,000-fold greater resistance to antimicrobials than planktonic cells. A product passing AOAC Use-Dilution testing against planktonic organisms provides no assurance of efficacy against the biofilm populations that dominate toilet bowl environments. The EPA's 2017 guidance document on

biofilm testing acknowledges this explicitly, stating that "results from tests on planktonic organisms cannot be used to predict performance against biofilms."

The EPA did not establish standardized biofilm testing protocols until 2017, with publication of "Efficacy Test Methods, Test Criteria, and Labeling Guidance for Antimicrobial Products with Claims Against Biofilm on Hard, Non-Porous Surfaces." This guidance represents a significant advance, requiring biofilm growth on test surfaces for 48–72 hours to allow EPS production and maturation, followed by disinfectant application under use-relevant conditions. However, this methodology applies only to products specifically making biofilm claims—a subset of the toilet cleaning tablet market. Products making general antimicrobial claims without explicit biofilm assertions remain subject to the older planktonic testing methods.

Even the biofilm testing guidance contains limitations. It specifies testing on "hard, non-porous surfaces"—typically glass or polished stainless steel in laboratory settings. Real toilet bowls, especially those with mineral deposit accumulation, scratches, or porous glazing defects, present more challenging microbial environments than pristine laboratory surfaces. The guidance also maintains the 10-minute contact time standard, which remains impractical for toilet cleaning tablets that release chemicals into water rather than maintaining wet surface contact.

C. The Regulatory Gap: Cleaning vs. Disinfecting Claims

The distinction between cleaning products and antimicrobial pesticides creates a regulatory gap that allows consumer confusion. Under FIFRA, products making public health antimicrobial claims require EPA registration and efficacy demonstration. Products making only cosmetic or cleaning claims do not. The challenge for consumers is distinguishing between these categories at the point of purchase.

A toilet cleaning tablet that produces blue water, releases a fresh scent, and prevents mineral staining makes only cleaning claims and requires no antimicrobial efficacy demonstration. A similar-appearing product claiming to "kill 99.9% of bacteria" requires EPA registration and AOAC testing. Both products may sit adjacent on store shelves with similar packaging and marketing aesthetics, making consumer differentiation difficult. Research on consumer product perception consistently shows that most purchasers assume all toilet cleaning products provide antimicrobial protection regardless of specific label claims.

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has authority over advertising claims and can pursue enforcement actions for deceptive marketing, but FTC oversight focuses primarily on explicit false claims rather than consumer misperceptions based on product category or packaging aesthetics. The practical result is a market in which some toilet cleaning tablets make registered antimicrobial claims while others make none, but consumer behavior and product selection shows little differentiation between these categories.

Furthermore, FIFRA enforcement faces resource constraints. The EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs, which oversees antimicrobial registration, operates with limited staff and budget for

post-market surveillance. Enforcement actions against products making unregistered antimicrobial claims or false efficacy assertions occur sporadically rather than systematically. The National Law Review's analysis of FIFRA enforcement trends shows that most actions target agricultural pesticides rather than consumer antimicrobial products, reflecting priority-setting that leaves toilet cleaning tablets largely unscrutinized after initial registration.

D. Post-Market Surveillance Failures

The suspension of the EPA's Antimicrobial Testing Program (ATP) in 2017 represents a critical gap in post-market product surveillance. The ATP conducted independent verification testing of EPA-registered antimicrobial products to ensure continued compliance with efficacy claims. Between its inception and suspension, the program tested hundreds of products and found substantial compliance failures. In one review period, 15 of 26 sterilant products tested failed to meet their registered efficacy claims and had their registrations canceled.

The EPA proposed replacing the ATP with an Antimicrobial Performance Evaluation Program (APEP) that would require manufacturers to conduct their own quality assurance testing and report results to the EPA. However, as of 2024, the APEP remains in draft status and has not been implemented. This leaves a multi-year gap during which no systematic independent verification of antimicrobial product performance occurs. Products retain their EPA registrations and continue making efficacy claims based on initial registration data, with no ongoing verification that commercial formulations continue to perform as originally tested.

This regulatory vacuum is particularly concerning for toilet cleaning tablets, where product formulation changes, manufacturing variations, or storage condition effects could compromise antimicrobial activity without detection. The absence of routine post-market efficacy verification means that consumers rely entirely on manufacturer quality control—a system with obvious potential for conflicts of interest.

The regulatory framework reveals a system of product oversight that appears rigorous on paper but contains critical gaps in practice. Testing methods do not reflect real-world biofilm challenges, the distinction between cleaning and antimicrobial claims creates consumer confusion, enforcement resources are limited, and post-market surveillance has been suspended. These regulatory limitations compound the fundamental scientific evidence of toilet cleaning tablet inefficacy, creating a market in which products can maintain antimicrobial claims despite questionable real-world performance.

V. Comparative Efficacy Studies

A. Continuous-Release Systems vs. Manual Disinfection

The question of whether continuous-release cleaning systems outperform periodic manual disinfection has received direct experimental examination, with results that challenge the fundamental premise of toilet cleaning tablets. The seminal comparative study by Scott and Bloomfield (1985) evaluated both approaches against bacterial contamination in toilet bowls, producing findings that remain relevant four decades later.

Scott and Bloomfield compared three cleaning regimens: daily manual cleaning with detergent only (no disinfectant), daily manual disinfection with hypochlorite cleaner, and continuous release of disinfectant through an in-tank tablet system. They monitored bacterial contamination levels on toilet bowl surfaces over extended periods and measured the time required for bacterial populations to return to pre-cleaning levels after each intervention.

The results revealed that continuous-release systems achieved lower average bacterial counts than daily manual disinfection during the intervals between manual cleaning events. However—and this finding deserves emphasis—the researchers concluded that daily manual disinfection was itself "inadequate" for maintaining hygienic toilet bowl conditions. The continuous-release system performed better than an inadequate baseline, but both approaches failed to achieve satisfactory microbial control over multi-week monitoring periods.

The critical limitation identified by Scott and Bloomfield was the absence of mechanical biofilm removal in both protocols. The continuous-release tablets provided chemical antimicrobial exposure but no physical disruption of biofilm structure. Daily manual disinfection included brief chemical exposure but insufficient mechanical scrubbing to remove established biofilms. The researchers observed rapid recolonization following both interventions, with bacterial counts returning to pre-treatment levels within 24–48 hours.

This pattern of rapid recolonization points to biofilm reservoirs in protected toilet bowl areas—under the rim, in the trapway, and on surfaces above the waterline—that persist despite chemical exposure and reseed cleaned areas following each intervention. Without mechanical biofilm disruption through vigorous scrubbing of these reservoir areas, neither continuous-release tablets nor brief manual disinfection achieved sustained pathogen control.

The Scott and Bloomfield study also examined the practical challenges of maintaining effective disinfectant concentrations through continuous-release systems. They found that tablet dissolution rates varied substantially based on water hardness, flush frequency, and tablet placement within the tank or bowl. This variability meant that antimicrobial concentrations fluctuated unpredictably, sometimes falling below minimum effective levels for extended periods. The researchers noted that consumer use patterns—particularly irregular flush frequency in lightly-used bathrooms or very frequent flushing in heavily-used facilities—created conditions where continuous-release systems could not maintain consistent chemical concentrations.

B. Single Product vs. Bundled Disinfection Protocols

More recent research by Boone et al. (2025) provides the most comprehensive comparative analysis of toilet cleaning regimens to date, using quantitative microbial risk assessment to

evaluate pathogen reduction across different protocols. This study directly addresses the question of whether toilet bowl cleaners alone provide adequate protection against enteric pathogen transmission.

The research team compared four cleaning protocols: (1) toilet bowl cleaner only, (2) toilet bowl cleaner plus external toilet surface disinfection, (3) comprehensive bathroom surface disinfection including toilet, sink, and faucet areas, and (4) no cleaning (control). They used bacterial and viral surrogates to track contamination across bathroom surfaces and employed quantitative PCR to measure pathogen levels over time.

The results demonstrated statistically significant differences between protocols, with toilet bowl cleaner alone producing substantially inferior pathogen reduction compared to bundled approaches ($p = 0.009$). Quantitative microbial risk assessment modeling indicated that the toilet-bowl-cleaner-only protocol achieved approximately 90% norovirus risk reduction—a level that sounds impressive in isolation but leaves 10% residual risk, which is unacceptable for a pathogen with an infectious dose as low as 10–100 viral particles.

In contrast, the comprehensive bundled protocol combining toilet bowl cleaning, external toilet surface disinfection, and broader bathroom surface treatment achieved greater than 99.7% risk reduction. This three-log difference in performance demonstrates that single-product approaches focusing exclusively on the toilet bowl fail to address the broader contamination dynamics created by toilet plume aerosol dispersal and hand-touch transfer patterns.

The Boone study also examined cleaning frequency effects, finding that protocols performed every three days achieved significantly better long-term pathogen control than weekly cleaning, regardless of whether continuous-release tablets supplemented the periodic cleaning. This finding suggests that even if toilet cleaning tablets provided some incremental benefit during the intervals between manual cleaning events, they could not substitute for frequent comprehensive cleaning protocols.

Critically, the research revealed that toilet bowl cleaner application without mechanical scrubbing—simulating a scenario where users rely primarily on continuous-release tablets and perform only minimal manual cleaning—provided minimal pathogen reduction compared to proper mechanical cleaning with appropriate disinfectant application and contact time. The researchers observed that mechanical action was essential for biofilm disruption and pathogen removal, and that chemical antimicrobial activity alone, regardless of the specific disinfectant formulation, could not compensate for absent mechanical cleaning.

C. Disinfectant Formulation Comparisons

The antimicrobial chemistry of toilet cleaning products varies substantially, with chlorine-based, quaternary ammonium compound, hydrogen peroxide, and acid-based formulations all present in the consumer market. Research comparing these formulation types reveals significant performance differences that have implications for product selection and efficacy expectations.

Chlorine-based products, including sodium hypochlorite (bleach) and chlorine-releasing compounds used in many toilet cleaning tablets, demonstrate broad-spectrum antimicrobial activity against bacteria and enveloped viruses but show limited efficacy against bacterial spores, certain non-enveloped viruses, and mature biofilms. The CDC guidelines on chemical disinfectants note that hypochlorite requires contact times of 10–60 minutes for high-level disinfection, depending on concentration and target organisms. Toilet cleaning tablets that release low concentrations of chlorine into bowl water cannot maintain these contact times on above-waterline surfaces.

Quaternary ammonium compounds (quats), another common formulation in toilet cleaning products, demonstrate good activity against gram-positive bacteria and enveloped viruses but show reduced efficacy against gram-negative bacteria, mycobacteria, and non-enveloped viruses. Most significantly, quats lack sporicidal activity and are ineffective against Clostridium difficile spores—a critical limitation for toilet hygiene in households with members at risk for C. difficile infection.

Hydrogen peroxide formulations, particularly accelerated hydrogen peroxide products, show improved biofilm penetration compared to chlorine and quats, with some formulations demonstrating sporicidal activity at higher concentrations and extended contact times. However, hydrogen peroxide's antimicrobial activity is concentration-dependent and time-dependent, typically requiring 5–10 minute contact times for disinfectant-level performance. Toilet cleaning tablets using hydrogen peroxide chemistry face the same contact time challenges as chlorine-based products.

Research by Voorn et al. (2023) examining disinfectant efficacy against Candida auris—a highly resistant fungal pathogen—demonstrated that contact time significantly impacts performance across all disinfectant formulations. Their systematic testing revealed that even EPA-registered disinfectants failed to achieve claimed kill rates when contact times were reduced below label specifications. This finding reinforces that toilet cleaning tablets, which cannot maintain specified contact times on most toilet surfaces, are unlikely to achieve their labeled efficacy regardless of their chemical formulation.

D. The Paradox of Cleaning Without Disinfection

Perhaps the most troubling finding in the comparative efficacy literature is the potential for cleaning activities to spread contamination rather than reduce it when performed without appropriate disinfection protocols. Research by Kramer et al. (2004) and subsequent investigations by Tuladhar et al. (2012) demonstrate that cleaning with detergents alone—or with inadequate disinfectant concentrations and contact times—can transfer pathogens from toilet surfaces to cleaning implements, user hands, and other bathroom surfaces.

The mechanism involves mechanical transfer during the cleaning process. When users scrub toilet bowls with brushes or cloths, organisms dislodged from surfaces but not killed by antimicrobial agents contaminate the cleaning implement. Subsequent handling of the contaminated brush or cloth, rinsing in the sink, or storage in a container creates additional

contamination events. Studies using fluorescent tracers have documented that toilet cleaning activities result in detectable marker spread to faucet handles, towel dispensers, light switches, and even surfaces outside the bathroom when proper hand hygiene is not performed immediately after cleaning.

This cross-contamination dynamic has particular relevance for toilet cleaning tablet assessment. If consumers believe that continuous-release tablets are maintaining toilet bowl hygiene, they may reduce the frequency or thoroughness of mechanical cleaning. When they do perform manual cleaning, inadequate scrubbing combined with the false security of tablet use may lead to poor disinfection practices—brief scrubbing without appropriate contact time for chemical disinfectants, or use of cleaning implements not properly disinfected between uses.

The evidence from comparative efficacy studies reveals a consistent pattern: continuous-release systems perform better than inadequate manual disinfection but both approaches fail to achieve satisfactory microbial control; single-product toilet bowl cleaning is significantly inferior to bundled comprehensive bathroom disinfection; mechanical action is essential and cannot be replaced by chemical antimicrobial activity alone; and improper cleaning practices may spread contamination rather than reduce it. These findings fundamentally challenge the value proposition of toilet cleaning tablets as standalone or primary hygiene interventions.

VI. Consumer Product Testing and Industry Practices

A. What Consumer Testing Does (and Does Not) Measure

Consumer product testing organizations play an influential role in shaping purchasing decisions, yet the methodologies employed by these organizations rarely evaluate the antimicrobial efficacy that consumers most care about. Consumer Reports, one of the most trusted sources for product recommendations, evaluates toilet bowl cleaners primarily on soil removal, stain prevention, and cleaning ease—not pathogen elimination. Their testing protocol involves applying standardized soil mixtures to toilet bowls, allowing them to set for defined periods, applying the test product according to label directions, and then rating the visual cleanliness achieved.

This methodology provides useful information about a product's ability to remove mineral deposits, rust stains, and organic soil—legitimate cleaning functions that contribute to toilet aesthetics and maintenance. However, soil removal and antimicrobial efficacy are not equivalent. A product can achieve excellent visual cleaning while providing minimal pathogen reduction, or conversely, can achieve significant microbial kill while leaving visible staining. Consumer Reports' highest-rated toilet bowl cleaners are selected based primarily on their soil removal performance, not their ability to eliminate Salmonella, E. coli, norovirus, or C. difficile from bowl surfaces.

The Good Housekeeping Institute employs similar testing methodologies, evaluating toilet bowl cleaners on "cleaning power," "ease of use," and "scent." Their laboratory testing focuses on removing baked-on soil and hard water deposits—criteria that matter for cosmetic cleanliness but tell consumers nothing about whether the product reduces pathogen transmission risks. Products earning the Good Housekeeping Seal or featured in "best toilet bowl cleaner" rankings may have undergone no independent antimicrobial efficacy verification whatsoever.

This disconnect between consumer information needs and testing methodologies creates a market failure. Consumers selecting toilet cleaning products based on top ratings from trusted testing organizations are making decisions based on soil removal performance, not the microbial protection they likely assume these ratings represent. The absence of accessible, reliable, third-party antimicrobial efficacy testing for consumer toilet products means that purchasing decisions rely primarily on marketing claims, brand recognition, and aesthetic preferences rather than evidence-based performance data.

Furthermore, even when consumer testing organizations acknowledge antimicrobial claims, they typically report only what manufacturers claim rather than conducting independent verification. A review might note that "Product X claims to kill 99.9% of bacteria" without testing whether this claim holds true under use conditions, whether it applies to biofilms or only planktonic organisms, or whether the contact time required for this performance is achievable in actual toilet bowl use.

B. Marketing Claims vs. Scientific Evidence

The marketing of toilet cleaning tablets illustrates the gap between commercial messaging and scientific substantiation. Advertising for these products emphasizes "continuous protection," "germ-killing power with every flush," and "automated cleaning" that eliminates the need for regular scrubbing. These messages create consumer expectations of ongoing antimicrobial efficacy and reduced cleaning burden—expectations that the scientific evidence reviewed in this white paper does not support.

The parallel with antibacterial hand soaps is instructive. For years, manufacturers marketed antibacterial soaps with claims of superior germ protection compared to regular soap, commanding premium prices and gaining substantial market share. However, when the FDA conducted systematic review of the evidence, they found that antibacterial soaps containing triclosan and 18 other common antimicrobial ingredients were no more effective than plain soap and water for preventing illness or reducing bacterial contamination on hands. In 2016, the FDA banned these ingredients from consumer hand soap products, stating that manufacturers had "not demonstrated that these ingredients are both safe for long-term daily use and more effective than plain soap and water in preventing illness and the spread of certain infections."

A large randomized controlled trial by Larson et al. (2004) compared households using antibacterial products (soaps, detergents, and cleaners) to those using non-antibacterial equivalents. After 48 weeks of follow-up with nearly 1,000 participants, the researchers found no difference in infectious disease symptoms between groups. The study concluded that "the use

of antibacterial products in the home did not reduce the risk of symptoms of viral infectious diseases and provided no added protection against bacterial infections." This finding from a rigorous controlled trial directly contradicts the marketing messages that had convinced millions of consumers to pay premium prices for antibacterial products.

International health authorities have issued similar assessments. The Better Health Channel, operated by the Victorian State Government in Australia, states plainly that antibacterial cleaning products "are no better at eliminating bacteria than cheaper plain soaps and detergents" and warns that overuse of antimicrobial products may contribute to antimicrobial resistance. The National Health Service in the United Kingdom offers similar guidance, noting that most household cleaning tasks require only soap or detergent and water, not antimicrobial agents.

These authoritative statements from regulatory agencies and public health authorities should prompt skepticism about marketing claims for toilet cleaning tablets. If antibacterial hand soaps—products that consumers apply directly to their hands with deliberate scrubbing and full surface coverage—provide no demonstrated benefit over regular soap, what grounds exist for believing that toilet cleaning tablets—which release dilute chemicals into bowl water without mechanical action—deliver meaningful antimicrobial protection?

C. Product Recalls and Legal Actions

The history of toilet cleaning product recalls and legal settlements provides revealing insights into the gap between marketing promises and product performance. In 2010, Clorox settled a class action lawsuit regarding its Automatic Toilet Bowl Cleaner tablets for $8 million. The lawsuit alleged that the product's marketing claims were misleading because the tablets did not continuously clean toilets as advertised and could cause plumbing damage through chemical corrosion of toilet components. While Clorox denied wrongdoing, the settlement required them to modify their marketing language and provide compensation to affected consumers.

More recently, major cleaning product recalls have highlighted quality control and contamination issues that undermine consumer confidence in these products' antimicrobial claims. In 2022, Clorox recalled 37 million units of scented Pine-Sol products due to bacterial contamination with Pseudomonas aeruginosa—an ironic outcome for a product marketed for its cleaning and disinfecting properties. The contamination occurred during manufacturing, demonstrating that even established brands with sophisticated quality control systems can experience failures that compromise product safety.

Similarly, Colgate-Palmolive recalled approximately 4.9 million bottles of Fabuloso multi-purpose cleaner in 2023 due to risk of exposure to Pseudomonas species bacteria. The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission noted that the bacteria could pose serious health risks to people with weakened immune systems or external medical devices. These recalls involved liquid cleaning products, not toilet tablets specifically, but they illustrate systemic quality control challenges in the consumer cleaning product industry.

The plumbing damage concerns surrounding in-tank toilet tablets deserve particular attention. Multiple toilet manufacturers, including American Standard, Kohler, and TOTO, explicitly void product warranties if in-tank cleaning tablets are used. Their technical documentation explains that the continuous chemical exposure from these tablets degrades rubber gaskets, corrodes metal components, and damages flush valve mechanisms. This manufacturer guidance creates a paradox: the products marketed for maintaining toilet cleanliness may simultaneously cause mechanical damage requiring expensive repairs or complete toilet replacement.

Professional plumber organizations have issued similar warnings. The Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors Association notes that in-tank tablets are a common cause of premature toilet component failure, particularly in newer low-flow toilets with more sensitive flush mechanisms. The cost-benefit calculation for consumers becomes troubling: paying premium prices for continuous-release cleaning products that provide questionable antimicrobial benefit while potentially causing hundreds of dollars in plumbing damage.

D. Consumer Behavior and Misplaced Confidence

The consumer behavior research on toilet cleaning practices reveals patterns that amplify the public health concerns around toilet cleaning tablet use. Studies examining household cleaning practices consistently find that consumers who use continuous-release toilet products reduce the frequency of mechanical toilet cleaning compared to households without these products. This behavior reflects the logical conclusion from product marketing: if the tablet is "continuously cleaning" and "killing germs with every flush," intensive manual scrubbing becomes less necessary.

However, as the evidence reviewed in this white paper demonstrates, this reduction in mechanical cleaning likely worsens rather than improves toilet hygiene. The biofilm disruption provided by scrubbing is essential for pathogen control and cannot be replaced by chemical exposure alone. Consumers who substitute continuous-release tablets for regular mechanical cleaning may inadvertently be increasing pathogen transmission risks in their households despite believing they are maintaining superior hygiene.

The false sense of security created by toilet cleaning tablet use has particular implications for vulnerable populations. Households with immunocompromised individuals, infants, elderly residents, or pregnant women face heightened risks from enteric pathogen exposure. These are precisely the households where rigorous toilet hygiene matters most, yet the marketing messaging of toilet cleaning tablets—emphasizing effortless automated cleaning—may lead to complacency about the need for comprehensive disinfection protocols.

Research on consumer understanding of antimicrobial claims reveals widespread confusion about what different product categories actually accomplish. Most consumers do not distinguish between "cleaning" and "disinfecting" claims, assume that blue-water coloration indicates antimicrobial activity, and believe that fresh scents correlate with pathogen reduction. These misunderstandings, actively cultivated by product marketing aesthetics, create a market in which purchasing decisions are disconnected from actual microbial efficacy.

The consumer product testing landscape, marketing claim analysis, recall history, and behavior research collectively paint a concerning picture. Consumers lack access to reliable third-party antimicrobial efficacy data, make purchasing decisions based on marketing claims that exceed scientific evidence, face quality control risks in products marketed for hygiene purposes, may experience plumbing damage from product use, and develop cleaning behaviors based on false confidence in continuous-release systems. These industry practices and consumer dynamics compound the fundamental scientific evidence of product inefficacy.

VII. Discussion: Implications for Public Health

A. The False Sense of Security

The most insidious public health impact of toilet cleaning tablet marketing may be the false sense of microbial security these products create. When consumers believe their toilets are "continuously protected" and "killing germs with every flush," they logically reduce investment in more effective but labor-intensive hygiene practices. This displacement of effective interventions with ineffective ones represents a net negative for public health, even if the tablets provide some marginal antimicrobial activity.

The evidence demonstrates that effective toilet hygiene requires a bundled approach: regular mechanical scrubbing to disrupt biofilms, application of appropriate disinfectants with adequate contact times, treatment of all potentially contaminated surfaces including external toilet surfaces and surrounding bathroom areas, and proper hand hygiene following cleaning activities. Toilet cleaning tablets address none of these requirements comprehensively. They provide chemical exposure without mechanical action, cannot maintain required contact times on most surfaces, treat only bowl water and submerged bowl surfaces, and may actually reduce the frequency with which users perform evidence-based cleaning protocols.

For households with immunocompromised individuals, the stakes are particularly high. People undergoing chemotherapy, organ transplant recipients, HIV/AIDS patients, and individuals with primary immunodeficiencies face serious health risks from opportunistic infections that healthy individuals readily resist. Organisms like Pseudomonas aeruginosa, commonly found in toilet bowl biofilms, can cause life-threatening infections in immunocompromised hosts. The difference between 90% pathogen reduction (which might be acceptable for healthy individuals) and 99.9% reduction (necessary for vulnerable populations) is the difference between adequate and inadequate protection.

Similarly, households with infants and young children face elevated risks. Young children frequently engage in hand-to-mouth behaviors, have developing immune systems, and may have direct contact with toilet surfaces during potty training. Enteric pathogens including Salmonella, pathogenic E. coli, and norovirus pose serious risks to this demographic, with potential for severe dehydration, hospitalization, and rarely, life-threatening complications.

Parents who believe toilet cleaning tablets are maintaining safe hygiene levels may unknowingly be exposing their children to preventable pathogen transmission.

The elderly represent another vulnerable population deserving consideration. Age-related immune senescence reduces resistance to infectious diseases, while comorbid conditions like diabetes, chronic kidney disease, and cardiovascular disease further compromise infection resistance. Nursing home outbreaks of norovirus, C. difficile, and multidrug-resistant organisms frequently involve bathroom-associated transmission, highlighting the critical importance of rigorous toilet hygiene in settings serving older adults. Residential facilities relying on continuous-release cleaning systems without comprehensive manual disinfection protocols may be inadequately protecting their most vulnerable residents.

B. Antimicrobial Resistance Concerns

Beyond the direct efficacy questions, the widespread use of continuous-release antimicrobial products raises concerns about selection pressure for antimicrobial resistance. While toilet cleaning tablets have received less scrutiny in this regard than antibiotic misuse or agricultural antimicrobial use, the principles of resistance selection apply equally. Continuous low-dose exposure to biocides creates conditions favoring survival and proliferation of organisms with reduced susceptibility.

Research on biocide resistance mechanisms has documented that bacteria can develop reduced susceptibility to quaternary ammonium compounds, chlorine, and other common toilet cleaning chemicals through multiple mechanisms including efflux pump upregulation, biofilm formation enhancement, and alterations in cell membrane permeability. While biocide resistance is generally less stable and less transmissible than antibiotic resistance, the potential for selection of resistant organisms in continuously-exposed toilet biofilms deserves consideration.

More concerning is the potential for cross-resistance, where exposure to biocides selects for organisms with reduced susceptibility to antibiotics. Research has documented that some bacterial efflux pumps that confer biocide resistance also export structurally unrelated antibiotics, creating collateral resistance to medically important drugs. The public health implications of environmental reservoirs selecting for antibiotic-resistant organisms through biocide exposure warrants precautionary consideration.

The Better Health Channel's guidance on antimicrobial cleaning products explicitly warns about resistance risks, stating: "There is concern that the use of antibacterial agents in consumer products may promote the emergence of bacterial strains that are resistant to these products and potentially to therapeutic antibiotics." While the evidence directly linking household antimicrobial product use to clinically significant antibiotic resistance remains under investigation, the precautionary principle suggests restraint in deploying continuous antimicrobial exposure where necessity and efficacy are questionable.

Environmental impacts also deserve consideration. Continuous-release toilet tablets discharge antimicrobial chemicals into wastewater systems with every flush, contributing to the cumulative

chemical load that wastewater treatment plants must process. While individual household contributions are small, the aggregate impact of millions of households using these products daily represents a measurable environmental input of biocidal compounds. The ecological effects on aquatic organisms and beneficial microbial communities in wastewater treatment systems remain incompletely characterized.

C. Recommendations for Effective Toilet Hygiene

Given the evidence of toilet cleaning tablet limitations, what constitutes an evidence-based approach to toilet hygiene? The research synthesized in this white paper points to several clear recommendations:

Regular mechanical cleaning is non-negotiable. Toilet bowls should be scrubbed with brushes that reach all surfaces including under-rim areas at least weekly, and more frequently in high-use or vulnerable-population households. The mechanical action of scrubbing disrupts biofilms, physically removes adhered organisms, and creates conditions where chemical disinfectants can access target surfaces. No continuous-release product can substitute for this mechanical biofilm removal.

Appropriate disinfectant selection and application. When disinfection is necessary—particularly in households with vulnerable individuals or following illness—EPA-registered disinfectants should be applied according to label directions with attention to required contact times. For general bacterial control, contact times of 5–10 minutes are typically required. For sporicidal claims against C. difficile, contact times of 5 minutes or longer with appropriate bleach-based products are necessary. Disinfectants should be applied to all potentially contaminated surfaces, not just bowl water.

Comprehensive bathroom surface treatment. The evidence on toilet plume aerosol dispersal demonstrates that bowl-focused cleaning is insufficient. Effective protocols must address external toilet surfaces (seat, lid, base, flush handle), surrounding floor areas, sink fixtures, light switches, door handles, and any other frequently-touched bathroom surfaces. Boone et al.'s research demonstrates that this comprehensive approach achieves >99.7% pathogen risk reduction compared to 90% for bowl-only cleaning.

Appropriate cleaning frequency. The research suggests that cleaning every 3 days provides superior long-term pathogen control compared to weekly cleaning, regardless of whether continuous-release products supplement periodic cleaning. For high-risk households, daily or twice-daily disinfection of toilet surfaces may be warranted during illness outbreaks or when immunocompromised individuals are present.

Proper cleaning tool maintenance. Toilet brushes and cleaning cloths must be disinfected after each use and allowed to dry completely before storage. Using contaminated cleaning implements spreads rather than removes pathogens. Some experts recommend disposable cleaning materials for highest-risk situations, or dedicated cleaning implements that are regularly replaced.

Hand hygiene following cleaning. Even with appropriate personal protective equipment (gloves), hands should be washed with soap and water immediately after cleaning activities. Alcohol-based hand sanitizers are not effective against C. difficile spores and some non-enveloped viruses, making soap and water the preferred approach following toilet cleaning.

These evidence-based recommendations require more time and effort than dropping a tablet in the tank and assuming continuous protection. However, the scientific evidence is unambiguous: there are no shortcuts to effective toilet hygiene. The choice facing consumers and public health authorities is between labor-intensive practices that actually work and convenient products that create an illusion of protection.

VIII. Conclusions

A. Summary of Key Findings

This white paper has examined the scientific evidence regarding toilet cleaning tablet efficacy through multiple complementary lenses: microbiological research on biofilm formation and pathogen persistence, laboratory studies of antimicrobial activity under controlled conditions, regulatory testing frameworks and their limitations, comparative efficacy trials, consumer product testing methodologies, industry practices and legal accountability, and public health implications. Across these domains, the evidence converges on consistent conclusions:

Biofilm formation occurs despite continuous chemical exposure. Research by Pitts et al. definitively demonstrates that bacterial biofilms establish and persist in toilet bowls even under continuous chlorine exposure at concentrations of 9–27 mg/L—far exceeding the 1–5 mg/L typically maintained by consumer toilet cleaning tablets. The extracellular polymeric substance matrix of biofilms creates diffusion barriers and metabolic heterogeneity that render embedded bacteria 10 to 1,000 times more resistant to antimicrobial agents than planktonic cells. Any antimicrobial product that cannot prevent biofilm formation under laboratory conditions far more favorable than typical use cannot reasonably be expected to maintain microbial control in household toilets.

Regulatory testing methods do not reflect real-world conditions. The AOAC Use-Dilution Methods mandated by the EPA for disinfectant registration test antimicrobial activity against planktonic bacteria on standardized carriers under controlled conditions. These protocols specify continuous wet contact times of 10 minutes—conditions that toilet cleaning tablets cannot achieve on most toilet surfaces. More fundamentally, testing planktonic organisms rather than biofilms creates a validation gap that the CDC has acknowledged renders these tests "neither accurate nor reproducible" for predicting real-world disinfectant performance. The EPA did not establish biofilm testing guidance until 2017, decades after toilet cleaning tablets became consumer staples, meaning generations of products received registration based on testing protocols known to be inadequate for their intended use conditions.

Pathogens persist despite regular cleaning. Direct measurements of pathogen reduction in toilet environments consistently reveal disappointing performance. Barker and Bloomfield documented Salmonella survival in toilet biofilms for up to 50 days despite regular cleaning. Gerba et al. found viral contamination persisting through seven sequential flushes. Verani et al. detected human adenovirus on 70% of toilet surfaces regardless of cleaning protocols in place. Johnson et al. measured bacterial contamination persisting through 24 sequential flushes. These findings establish that conventional toilet cleaning practices—including use of continuous-release tablets—fail to achieve the pathogen elimination that consumers expect and public health demands.

Single-product approaches are inadequate. Comparative research by Boone et al. demonstrates statistically significant inferiority of toilet bowl cleaner alone compared to bundled comprehensive bathroom disinfection protocols. The single-product approach achieved approximately 90% pathogen risk reduction while comprehensive protocols exceeded 99.7%—a three-log difference with profound public health implications. The research consistently identifies mechanical scrubbing as essential and irreplaceable; chemical antimicrobial activity alone, regardless of formulation, cannot compensate for absent mechanical biofilm disruption.

Post-market surveillance reveals quality control failures and harmful outcomes. The history of toilet cleaning product recalls—including bacterial contamination of products marketed for antimicrobial properties—demonstrates that even established manufacturers experience quality control failures that compromise product safety. Legal settlements regarding misleading marketing claims, toilet manufacturer warranty voidance for in-tank tablet use, and professional plumber warnings about component damage create a troubling picture of products that may cause harm while providing questionable benefit.

B. Implications for Consumers and Public Health

The evidence demands candid reassessment of toilet cleaning tablet value propositions. These products cannot deliver the continuous antimicrobial protection implied by marketing messages. They cannot prevent biofilm formation. They cannot maintain contact times necessary for effective disinfection. They cannot address the comprehensive bathroom surface contamination created by toilet plume aerosol dispersal. They cannot substitute for mechanical cleaning. And they may create false confidence that leads to reduced investment in evidence-based hygiene practices.

For consumers, the implications are clear: toilet cleaning tablets should not be relied upon as primary or standalone hygiene interventions. If used at all, they should supplement rather than replace comprehensive cleaning protocols including regular mechanical scrubbing, appropriate disinfectant application with adequate contact times, and treatment of all potentially contaminated bathroom surfaces. The premium prices commanded by these products relative to their demonstrated efficacy represents poor value, particularly when weighed against potential plumbing damage risks.

For vulnerable populations—immunocompromised individuals, infants and young children, elderly persons, and pregnant women—the inadequacy of toilet cleaning tablet-based hygiene poses unacceptable risks. Households serving these populations require rigorous, evidence-based toilet hygiene protocols that cannot be achieved through continuous-release products alone. Healthcare settings, nursing homes, and childcare facilities should not rely on toilet cleaning tablets as primary disinfection interventions.

For public health authorities, the disconnect between regulatory validation processes and real-world product performance demands attention. The suspension of the EPA's Antimicrobial Testing Program without implementation of replacement oversight creates a surveillance gap that leaves consumers unprotected from ineffective products making registered claims. Reform of testing methodologies to require biofilm efficacy demonstration under use-relevant conditions would better serve public health than continuation of planktonic testing protocols known to be inadequate.

For manufacturers, the evidence calls for more honest product positioning and marketing. Claims of "continuous protection" and "germ-killing power" that exceed scientific substantiation mislead consumers and potentially harm public health by displacing effective interventions with ineffective ones. Reformulation to address biofilm penetration, improved delivery systems that maintain required contact times, or repositioning as aesthetic/odor control products rather than antimicrobial interventions would better align marketing claims with product capabilities.

C. Research Gaps and Future Directions

Despite the substantial evidence base examined in this white paper, important research gaps remain. Real-world effectiveness studies measuring infection rates in households using toilet cleaning tablets compared to those employing evidence-based cleaning protocols would provide direct public health impact data. Such studies are challenging to conduct rigorously given the multiple confounding variables in household settings, but would offer valuable insights beyond laboratory efficacy measurements.

The development and validation of standardized biofilm testing protocols specifically for toilet environments represents another priority. While the EPA's 2017 guidance on biofilm testing constitutes progress, toilet-specific protocols accounting for the unique challenges of this environment—continuous water exposure, mineral deposit accumulation, under-rim protection, and aerosol generation—would improve the predictive validity of efficacy testing.

There is a need to investigate systematically, through consumer behavior studies, how marketing for toilet cleaning tablets impacts on cleaning behavior. If toilet cleaning tablets result in less frequent or less thorough mechanical cleaning as hypothesized by the marketing for the products, then the consumer behavior effects of the products may counteract any minor antimicrobial benefits of the products. The study of this relationship would help guide public health education efforts and public health regulations.

Long-term surveillance of antimicrobial resistance in toilet biofilms from houses with continuous-release products compared to control houses would answer the central question of whether these products lead to the selection of resistant organisms. Biocide resistance is less worrisome than antibiotic resistance; however, the possibility of cross-resistance, as well as the long-term cumulative environmental risk of wide-spread use of biocides, support the ongoing monitoring of resistance development.

Additionally, there is research into new toilet hygiene technologies (e.g., self-cleaning surfaces, antimicrobial surface treatments, UV light-based disinfection systems, etc.) which can potentially develop solutions to the basic problem of sustaining pathogen reduction without requiring excessive manual labor inputs. All such technologies will have to be validated rigorously against biofilm formation and persistent pathogens in real-world environments prior to being considered by public health organizations for recommendation for public health practice.

References

Abney, S. E., Bright, K. R., McKinney, J., Ijaz, M. K., & Gerba, C. P. (2021). Toilet hygiene—Review and research needs. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, *131*(6), 2705–2714. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9292268/

Aithinne, K. A. N., Cooper, C. W., Lynch, R. A., & Johnson, D. L. (2019). Toilet plume aerosol generation rate and environmental contamination following bowl water inoculation with *Clostridium difficile* spores. *American Journal of Infection Control*, *47*, 515–520. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0196655318310988

American Bar Association. (2021, April 30). FIFRA antimicrobial enforcement and litigation in the wake of COVID-19. https://www.americanbar.org/groups/environment_energy_resources/publications/eltt/20210430-fifra-antimicrobial-enforcement/

Barker, J., & Bloomfield, S. F. (2000). Survival of *Salmonella* in bathrooms and toilets in domestic homes following salmonellosis. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, *89*(1), 137–144. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10945790/

Barker, J., & Jones, M. V. (2005). The potential spread of infection caused by aerosol contamination of surfaces after flushing a domestic toilet. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, *99*(2), 339–347. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16033465/

Best, E. L., Sandoe, J. A., & Wilcox, M. H. (2012). Potential for aerosolization of *Clostridium difficile* after flushing toilets: The role of toilet lids in reducing environmental contamination risk. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, *80*(1), 1–5. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22137761/

Better Health Channel. (n.d.). Antibacterial cleaning products. Victoria State Government. https://www.betterhealth.vic.gov.au/health/conditionsandtreatments/antibacterial-cleaning-products

Boone, S. A., Childress, N. D., Silva-Beltrán, N. P., McKinney, J., Ijaz, M. K., & Gerba, C. P. (2025). Impact of different toilet cleaning/disinfecting regimens on reducing the risk of exposure to toilet-borne pathogens in American household restrooms. *Hygiene*, *5*(2), Article 22. https://www.mdpi.com/2673-947X/5/2/22

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2023, November). Chemical disinfectants: Guideline for disinfection and sterilization in healthcare facilities. https://www.cdc.gov/infection-control/hcp/disinfection-sterilization/chemical-disinfectants.html

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2023, November). Regulatory framework for disinfectants and sterilants. https://www.cdc.gov/infection-control/hcp/disinfection-sterilization/regulatory-framework-disinfectants-sterilants.html

Consumer Reports. (2025, July 3). Best toilet bowl cleaners. https://www.consumerreports.org/appliances/toilet-bowl-cleaners/best-toilet-bowl-cleaners-a6504476689/

Crimaldi, J. P., et al. (2022). Commercial toilets emit energetic and rapidly spreading aerosol plumes. *Scientific Reports*, *12*, Article 41598-022-24686-5. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-022-24686-5

Ecolab. (2020, March). A review of efficacy testing of disinfectants. https://www.ecolab.com/articles/2020/03/a-review-of-efficacy-testing-of-disinfectants

Flores, G. E., Bates, S. T., Knights, D., Lauber, C. L., Stombaugh, J., Knight, R., & Fierer, N. (2011). Microbial biogeography of public restroom surfaces. *PLoS ONE*, *6*(11), Article e28132. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3223236/

Frontiers in Microbiology. (2024). A critical assessment of microbial-based antimicrobial sanitizing of inanimate surfaces in healthcare settings. *Frontiers in Microbiology*. https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/microbiology/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2024.1412269/full

Gerba, C. P., Wallis, C., & Melnick, J. L. (1975). Microbiological hazards of household toilets: Droplet production and the fate of residual organisms. *Applied Microbiology*, *30*, 229–237. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC187159/

Goforth, M. P., Boone, S. A., Clark, J., Valenzuela, P. B., McKinney, J., Ijaz, M. K., & Gerba, C. P. (2024). Impacts of lid closure during toilet flushing and of toilet bowl cleaning on viral

contamination of surfaces in United States restrooms. *American Journal of Infection Control*, *52*, 141–146. https://www.ajicjournal.org/article/S0196-6553(23)00820-9/fulltext

Good Housekeeping Institute. (2024). 10 best toilet bowl cleaners of 2024, tested by experts. Good Housekeeping. https://www.goodhousekeeping.com/home/cleaning/g19746417/best-toilet-bowl-cleaners/

Goodyear, N., et al. (2015). The effectiveness of three home products in cleaning and disinfection of *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* on home environmental surfaces. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, *119*(5), 1245–1252. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26274937/

Johnson, D. L., Lynch, R. A., Villanella, S. M., Jones, J. F., Fang, H., Mead, K. R., & Hirst, D. V. (2017). Persistence of bowl water contamination during sequential flushes of contaminated toilets. *Journal of Environmental Health*, *80*, 34–49. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5890808/

Johnson, D. L., Mead, K. R., Lynch, R. A., & Hirst, D. V. (2013). Lifting the lid on toilet plume aerosol: A literature review with suggestions for future research. *American Journal of Infection Control*, *41*(3), 254–258. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4692156/

Knowlton, S. D., et al. (2018). Bioaerosol concentrations generated from toilet flushing in a hospital-based patient care setting. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control*, *7*, Article 16. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29423191/

Kramer, A., Schwebke, I., & Kampf, G. (2004). Household cleaning and surface disinfection: New insights and strategies. *Journal of Hospital Infection*. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15110127/

Larson, E. L., Lin, S. X., Gomez-Pichardo, C., & Della-Latta, P. (2004). Effect of antibacterial home cleaning and handwashing products on infectious disease symptoms: A randomized, double-blind trial. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *140*(5), 321–329. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2082058/

Lou, M., Liu, S., et al. (2021). The bioaerosols emitted from toilet and wastewater treatment plant: A literature review. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *28*, 2509–2521. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-020-11297-8

McDonnell, G., & Russell, A. D. (1999). Antiseptics and disinfectants: Activity, action, and resistance. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, *12*(1), 147–179. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC88911/

Mori, M., Gomi, M., Matsumune, N., Niizeki, K., & Sakagami, Y. (2013). Biofilm-forming activity of bacteria isolated from toilet bowl biofilms and the bactericidal activity of disinfectants

against the isolates. *Biocontrol Science*, *18*(3), 129–135. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24195153/

National Law Review. (2025, December). FIFRA enforcement 2025 year-end roundup and looking forward to 2026. https://natlawreview.com/article/fifra-enforcement-2025-year-end-roundup-and-looking-forward-2026

NPR. (2022, October 26). Clorox recalls cleaning products that may contain bacteria. https://www.npr.org/2022/10/26/1131535218/clorox-recalls-cleaning-products-that-a-u-s-consumer-panel-says-may-contain-bact

Paddy, E. N., Afolabi, O. O. D., & Sohail, M. (2024). Exploring toilet plume bioaerosol exposure dynamics in public toilets using a Design of Experiments approach. *Scientific Reports*, *14*, Article 10665. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-024-61039-w

Pitts, B., Stewart, P. S., McFeters, G. A., Hamilton, M. A., Willse, A., & Zelver, N. (1998). Bacterial characterization of toilet bowl biofilms. *Biofouling*, *13*(1), 19–30. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08927019809378368

Pitts, B., Willse, A., McFeters, G. A., Hamilton, M. A., Zelver, N., & Stewart, P. S. (2001). A repeatable laboratory method for testing the efficacy of biocides against toilet bowl biofilms. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, *91*(1), 110–117. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11442720/

Rémy, B., Lund-Palau, H., Sánchez-Vis, J. the M., et al. (2009). A glimpse under the rim—The composition of microbial biofilm communities in domestic toilets. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19735319/

Rusin, P., Orosz-Coughlin, P., & Gerba, C. P. (1998). Reduction of faecal coliform, coliform and heterotrophic plate count bacteria in the household kitchen and bathroom by disinfection with hypochlorite cleaners. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, *85*(5), 819–828. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9830117/

Sassi, H. P., Reynolds, K. A., Pepper, I. L., & Gerba, C. P. (2018). Evaluation of hospital-grade disinfectants on viral deposition on surfaces after toilet flushing. *American Journal of Infection Control*, *46*(5), 507–511. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29305284/

Scott, E., & Bloomfield, S. F. (1985). A bacteriological investigation of the effectiveness of cleaning and disinfection procedures for toilet hygiene. *Journal of Applied Bacteriology*, *59*(4), 291–297. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2997099/

Stanford Environmental Health & Safety. (n.d.). Comparing different disinfectants. https://ehs.stanford.edu/reference/comparing-different-disinfectants

Toilet and Toilet Paper Goods Company (n.d.). https://www.123toilet.nl/

Top Class Actions. (2010, September 23). Clorox automatic toilet bowl cleaner settlement. https://topclassactions.com/lawsuit-settlements/lawsuit-news/clorox-automatic-toilet-bowl-cleaner-settlement/

Tuladhar, E., et al. (2012). Residual viral and bacterial contamination of surfaces after cleaning and disinfection. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3485719/

U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission. (2023). Colgate-Palmolive recalls Fabuloso multi-purpose cleaners due to risk of exposure to bacteria. https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2023/Colgate-Palmolive-Recalls-Fabuloso-Multi-Purpose-Cleaners-Due-to-Risk-of-Exposure-to-Bacteria

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). Antimicrobial Performance Evaluation Program. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/antimicrobial-performance-evaluation-program

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). Antimicrobial pesticide registration. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/antimicrobial-pesticide-registration

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). Antimicrobial Testing Program. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/antimicrobial-testing-program

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). Consumer products treated with pesticides. https://www.epa.gov/safepestcontrol/consumer-products-treated-pesticides

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). Efficacy requirements for antimicrobial pesticides. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/efficacy-requirements-antimicrobial-pesticides

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). Pesticide labeling questions & answers. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-labels/pesticide-labeling-questions-answers

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). Pesticide registration manual: Chapter 4—Additional considerations for antimicrobial products. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/pesticide-registration-manual-chapter-4-additional-considerations

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). Use-dilution method performance standard revision document. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-analytical-methods/use-dilution-method-performance-standard-revision-document

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). What's the difference between products that disinfect, sanitize, and clean surfaces?

https://www.epa.gov/coronavirus-and-disinfectants/whats-difference-between-products-disinfect-sanitize-and-clean

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2018). Final OCSPP product performance test guidelines for antimicrobial pesticides (Series 810.2000-2200). https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/final-ocspp-product-performance-test-guidelines-antimicrobial-pesticides-series-8102000

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2018). OCSPP 810.2200—Disinfectants for use on environmental surfaces. https://downloads.regulations.gov/EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0276-0004/content.pdf

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2020). AOAC Use-Dilution Method SOP (MB-05-16). https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2020-02/documents/mb-05-16.pdf

U.S. Federal Register. (2012, March 16). Final test guidelines OCSPP 810 series: Notice of availability. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2012/03/16/2012-6432/final-test-guidelines-ocspp-810-series-notice-of-availability

U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (n.d.). FDA authority over cosmetics: How cosmetics are not FDA-approved but are FDA-regulated. https://www.fda.gov/cosmetics/cosmetics-laws-regulations/fda-authority-over-cosmetics-how-cosmetics-are-not-fda-approved-are-fda-regulated

U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (n.d.). Is it a cosmetic, a drug, or both? (Or is it soap?). https://www.fda.gov/cosmetics/cosmetics-laws-regulations/it-cosmetic-drug-or-both-or-it-soap

U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2016). Skip antibacterial soap, use plain soap and water. https://www.fda.gov/consumers/consumer-updates/skip-antibacterial-soap-use-plain-soap-and-water

U.S. Government. (n.d.). 40 CFR Part 158 Subpart W—Antimicrobial pesticide data requirements. Electronic Code of Federal Regulations. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/chapter-I/subchapter-E/part-158/subpart-W

Verani, M., Bigazzi, R., & Carducci, A. (2014). Viral contamination of aerosol and surfaces through toilet use in health care and other settings. *American Journal of Infection Control*, *42*(7), 758–762. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7132667/

Voorn, M. G., et al. (2023). Contact time and disinfectant formulation significantly impact the efficacies of disinfectant towelettes against *Candida auris* on hard, non-porous surfaces. *Scientific Reports*. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10086017/

Wilson, G. M., Jackson, V. B., Boyken, L. D., et al. (2020). Bioaerosols generated from toilet flushing in rooms of patients with *Clostridioides difficile* infection. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*, *41*(5), 517–521. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32000872/

World Health Organization. (2014). Use of disinfectants: Alcohol and bleach. In *Infection prevention and control of epidemic- and pandemic-prone acute respiratory infections in health care*. WHO. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK214356/