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Application of Highly Purified Electrolyzed Chlorine Dioxide for Tilapia Fillet Disinfection
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This research aimed to develop an electrolysis method to generate high-concentration chlorine dioxide (ClO$_2$) for tilapia fillet disinfection. The designed generator produced up to 3500 ppm of ClO$_2$ at up to 99% purity. Tilapia fillets were soaked in a 400 ppm ClO$_2$ solution for 5, 10, and 25 min. Results show that total plate counts of tilapia, respectively, decreased by 5.72 to 3.23, 2.10, and 1.09 log CFU/g. In addition, a 200 ppm ClO$_2$ solution eliminated coliform bacteria and Escherichia coli in 5 min with shaking treatment. Furthermore, ClO$_2$ and trihalomethanes (THMs) residuals on tilapia fillets were analyzed by GC/MS and were nondetectable (GC-MS detection limit was 0.12 ppb). The results conform to Taiwan’s environmental protection regulations and act governing food sanitation.

1. Introduction

Chlorine dioxide (ClO$_2$) is a strong oxidant widely applied for sterilization, disinfection, and waste-water treatment. It is commonly used on drinking water and environmental disinfection. It was also recommended as a commercial sanitizer to replace electrolyzed oxidizing water [1, 2], chlorine (Cl$_2$), hypochlorous acid (HOCl), and hypochlorite (OCl$^-$) [3–5]. Contact of chlorine dioxide with organic substances in food or water results in microbial resistance and inactivation, but it also produces four trihalomethane (THM) byproducts, that is, chloroform, bromodichloromethane, dibromochloromethane, and bromoform, which are associated with toxicity and carcinogenesis [6–9]. In Taiwan, tilapia fillets are an important economic product, and it is common practice to use sodium hypochlorite (NaClO) as a disinfecting agent for processing tilapia fillets; however, treatment of this type could lead to serious problems involving residual THMs in treated seafood [4, 10–12]. As for its application for vegetable and fruit disinfection, ClO$_2$ gas has been successfully used to disinfect strawberries, lettuce, cabbage, and cucumbers with continuous methods [4, 13–17]. In this work, the bactericidal efficacy of ClO$_2$ was evaluated for cleaning tilapia fillets with different cleaning methods.

Commercial ClO$_2$ is commonly generated using chemical methods that react sodium chloride, sodium hypochlorite, or sodium chlorate with sulfuric acid or hydrochloric acid [18, 19]. The chemical method of producing ClO$_2$ needs a strong acid (pH 2–3), inhibits Cl$_2$ hydrolysis, and takes a long time for activation. The yield of ClO$_2$ depends on the purity of the raw materials, the catalyst, pH, reaction time, and temperature [20–24]. Furthermore, it was discovered that electrolyzing sodium chlorite can produce highly purified ClO$_2$ [25, 26]. Therefore, the objective of this study is to develop novel electrolysis equipment to produce highly purified, low-cost ClO$_2$ to disinfect with water, while simultaneously monitoring trihalomethane (THM) residuals on tilapia fillets.
2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Materials. Tilapia fillets were bought from a local traditional market in Pingtung, Taiwan. The microbiological media used in this study were peptone and tryptic soy agar (TSA) purchased from Difco Laboratories (Detroit, MI, USA); these were prepared according to the manufacturer’s specifications. 3M Coliform and \textit{E. coli} Petrifilm no. 6414 were purchased from Microbiology Products 3M Health Care (St. Paul, MN, USA).

2.2. \textit{ClO}_2 Electrolysis Equipment (\textit{ClO}_2 Generator). The self-designed electrolysis equipment consisted of a raw material tank, an electrolyzer, an air pump, two \textit{ClO}_2 collecting tanks, and a cooling system (Taiwan Patent, no. 200722557) [27]. Figure 1 shows the designed chlorine dioxide electrolysis equipment. The internal structure and reaction of the electrolyzer are shown in Figure 2. Saturated saline and sodium hypochlorite enter and mix in the electrolyzer system using a direct current (100–110 A, 7–8 V), the electrolyzed temperature was controlled to 55–65°C, and the electrolyzed material supply rate was 10 L/h. The temperature of the \textit{ClO}_2 collecting tank was maintained at 5–10°C by cooling water from the cooling system. NaCl was electrolyzed into NaClO_2. The reaction equation is as follows:

\begin{equation}
\text{NaCl} + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{NaClO}_2 + 2\text{H}_2 \uparrow .
\end{equation}

Meanwhile, the NaClO_2 was further electrolyzed, the \textit{ClO}_2^- was attracted by the cathode, and \textit{H}_2\text{O} was attracted by the anode to release \textit{H}_2 (Figure 2). The reaction equations are as follows:

\begin{equation}
\text{anode: } \text{ClO}_2^- \rightarrow \text{ClO}_2 \uparrow + e^- ;
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{cathode: } \text{H}_2\text{O} + e^- \rightarrow \text{OH}^- + \frac{1}{2}\text{H}_2 ;
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{overall: } 2\text{NaClO}_2 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 2\text{ClO}_2 + 2\text{NaOH} + \text{H}_2 \uparrow \\
\text{NaCl} + \text{NaClO}_2 + 4\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 2\text{ClO}_2 + 2\text{NaOH} + 3\text{H}_2 \uparrow .
\end{equation}

The resultant ClO_2 was aspirated out and collected into 5–10°C pure water in the two collecting tanks. The NaOH solution was collected separately. The oxidation/reduction potential (ORP) and pH of the ClO_2 solutions were measured using an ORP/pH meter (Mettler-Toledo Seven Easy ORP/pH meter, Kaoshiung, Taiwan).

\textit{ClO}_2 analysis: the concentration of \textit{ClO}_2 was analyzed using the iodine method [28]. The \textit{ClO}_2 solution at 10 mL was diluted 200 times with pure water. It was adjusted to five pH levels and then titrated with a 0.01 N sodium thiosulfite solution. The titration volumes were A, B, C, D, and E. The following calculation formulas were used to calculate the concentrations of \textit{ClO}_2, \textit{Cl}_2, \textit{ClO}_2^-, and \textit{ClO}_3^- :

\begin{equation}
\text{ClO}_2 (\text{ppm}) = \left( \frac{5}{4} \right) \times (B - D) \times \frac{N}{13,490/\text{sample volume}},
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{Cl}_2 (\text{ppm}) = D \times N \times 16,863/\text{sample volume},
\end{equation}
Figure 2: Internal structure and reaction of the electrolysis system.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ClO}_2^- (\text{ppm}) &= \left[ E - (A + B) \right] \times N \\
&\quad \times 13,909/\text{sample volume}, \\
\text{ClO}_3^- (\text{ppm}) &= \left[ A - \frac{(B - D)}{4} \right] \times N \\
&\quad \times 13,909/\text{sample volume}.
\end{align*}
\]

Here, \( N \) is the concentration of the sodium thiosulfite solution.

2.3. Cleaning Methods. Tilapia fillets were incubated at 37°C until the total plate count reached 5–6 log CFU/g. The different purities (45%–99%) of 400 mg/L ClO\(_2\) solutions were used to test the effect of tilapia disinfection. Tilapia fillets were inoculated with coliforms or \textit{E. coli} at a concentration of 5–6 log CFU/g. At 99% purity, ClO\(_2\) solutions of 50, 100, and 200 ppm were used to wash the fillets by soaking or shaking treatment for 5, 15, and 25 min, and the total plate counts, coliforms, and \textit{E. coli} of the fillets were determined.

2.4. Microbiological Analyses. The total plate count assay followed the China National Standard (CNS 10890 N6186) [29] method: 1 mL of masticated tissue liquid was serially (1:10) diluted in 9 mL of 0.1% sterile peptone water, and 0.1 mL portions of appropriate diluents were surface-plated on TSA. The plates were then incubated at 37°C for 48 h in duplicate. CFUs were counted and expressed per gram of sample after logarithmic conversion. The coliform and \textit{E. coli} assays followed Sasithorn and Sirirat [30] using 1 mL of
Table 1: Constituents of chlorine dioxide aqueous solution on different constituent ratios of electrolytes.

| Electrolyte constituent ratio | 7% NaClO₂ | 8% NaClO₂ | 9% NaClO₂ | 10% NaClO₂ |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Constituents of chlorine dioxide aqueous solution | 3193.76<sup>a</sup> | 3612.31<sup>c</sup> | 4232.49<sup>b</sup> | 4738.36<sup>a</sup> |
| ClO₂ (ppm) | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| ClO<sup>−</sup> (ppm) | 16.02<sup>a</sup> | ND | ND | ND |
| ClO<sup>3</sup>− (ppm) | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Cl₂ (ppm) | ND | 9.75<sup>b</sup> | 10.64<sup>a</sup> | 10.64<sup>a</sup> |
| Total chlorine<sup>∗</sup> (ppm) | 3209.78<sup>d</sup> | 3622.06<sup>c</sup> | 4243.12<sup>b</sup> | 4749.00<sup>a</sup> |
| ClO₂ purity<sup>∗∗</sup> (%) | 99.50<sup>a</sup> | 99.73<sup>a</sup> | 99.75<sup>a</sup> | 99.78<sup>a</sup> |
| pH (unit) | 2.36<sup>a</sup> | 2.34<sup>a</sup> | 2.38<sup>a</sup> | 2.18<sup>b</sup> |
| Oxidation reduction potential (millivolt) | 1.32<sup>c</sup> | 1.38<sup>b</sup> | 1.44<sup>a</sup> | 1.44<sup>a</sup> |

<sup>a–d</sup>Means in the same column followed by different superscripts are significantly different at P < 0.05 (Duncan's multiple range test).

<sup>∗</sup>Total chlorine (ppm) = ClO₂ + ClO<sup>−</sup> + ClO<sup>3</sup>− + Cl₂.

<sup>∗∗</sup>ClO₂ purity = [ClO₂/(ClO₂ + ClO<sup>−</sup> + ClO<sup>3</sup>− + Cl₂)] × 100%.

Table 2: Total bacterial counts of tilapia fillets for various purities in 400 ppm chlorine dioxide solutions.

| Treatment time (min) | 45% | 50% | 60% | 70% | 80% | 90% | 99% |
|----------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Total bacteria count log (CFU/g)<sup>∗</sup> | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 5.60<sup>a</sup> | 5.51<sup>a</sup> | 4.53<sup>b</sup> | 4.38<sup> </sup><sup>d</sup> | 4.13<sup>d</sup> | 3.96<sup>e</sup> | 3.23<sup>f</sup> |
| 15 | 5.44<sup>a</sup> | 5.43<sup>a</sup> | 4.3<sup>b</sup> | 4.09<sup>c</sup> | 3.98<sup>d</sup> | 3.29<sup>e</sup> | 2.1<sup>f</sup> |
| 25 | 5.33<sup>a</sup> | 4.3<sup>b</sup> | 3.13<sup>c</sup> | 2.91<sup>b</sup> | 2.74<sup>d</sup> | 2.54<sup>d</sup> | 1.09<sup>g</sup> |

<sup>a–g</sup>Means in the same column followed by different superscripts are significantly different at P < 0.05 (Duncan's multiple range test).

<sup>∗</sup>Original microbial load: 5.72 log (CFU/g).

2.5. Residual THMs Analyses. The analytical procedure was modified from Stack et al.'s [31] gas chromatographic (GC) method on an Agilent 5890 system coupled to an Agilent 5973N mass spectrometer (MS) (Palo Alto, CA). Chromatographic separation was performed using a capillary column (HP-5, 30m × 0.32mm, 0.25 µm phase film thickness) from Agilent Technologies. The initial temperature was 45°C for 3 min and then increased by 8°C/min to a final temperature of 220°C for 20.5 min. The injector temperature was set to 200°C. Nitrogen was used as the carrier gas at a flow rate of 38.5 mL/min.

MS was operated in the electron ionization mode at 70 eV. The mass range was scanned at 40–350 m/z and for 0.60 seconds per scan for the full-scan mode. Temperatures for the trap, manifold, and transfer line were set to 250, 50, and 280°C, respectively. All data for quantification were collected in the selected ion monitoring mode at 83 and 85 m/z for chloroform, 127 and 129 m/z for dibromochloromethane, and 173 m/z for bromoform.

2.6. Statistical Analysis. Three replicates were conducted, and each sample was assayed in duplicate. Data collected from the experiments were analyzed by an analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Duncan’s multiple range test using the SAS 8.2 program [32]. Significant differences between tested parameters were determined based on a 95% confidence level (P < 0.05).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Effects of Different Ratios of NaClO₂ for High Concentrations of ClO₂. Table 1 shows that 10% NaClO₂ and 20% NaCl generated 4749 ppm of total chlorine and 99.8% pure ClO₂, respectively. The pH was 2.18, and ORP was 1440 mV (Table 1). When the purity of ClO₂ varied from 99.5% to 99.8%, the pH increased from 2.36 to 2.18. Under an acidic condition, Cl₂ easily dissociated into Cl<sup>−</sup>, and ClO₂ mainly dissociated into ClO<sup>2</sup>− and ClO<sup>3</sup>−, with a small portion dissociating into Cl<sup>−</sup>172, 33, 34]. A great quantity of Cl<sup>−</sup> resulted from excessive NaCl in the raw materials which contained NaCl and sodium hypochlorite. At the anode side, NaCl was converted into NaClO<sub>2</sub> and then into NaClO₃. NaClO₃ was affected by the reducing reaction from the cathode side, producing Cl₂, Cl<sup>−</sup> and H<sup>+</sup>. The Cl<sup>−</sup> and H<sup>+</sup> then formed into very small amounts of HCl. These reaction cycles generated NaOH and ClO₂, producing Cl₂.

3.2. Effect of ClO₂ Purity on Tilapia Fillet Disinfection. Tilapia fillets were soaked in 400 ppm of 99% pure ClO₂ for 5, 15, and 25 min. Results indicated that total plate counts on tilapia fillets decreased from 5.72 log CFU/g to 3.23, 2.1, and 1.09 log CFU/g, respectively (Table 2). Although ClO₂ solutions contained 45%, 50%, and 60% of freely available chlorine, the bactericidal effect was not so obviously effective. One of the
Table 3: Total bacterial counts for tilapia fillets disinfected by soaking or shaking treatments at different chlorine dioxide concentrations.

| Washing method | Concentration (ppm) | Cleaning time (min) | Total bacteria count log (CFU/g) |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
|                |                     | 5                   | 15                               | 25                               |
| Soaking        | Control             | 5.84^a              | 5.80^a                           | 5.78^a                           |
|                | 50                  | 5.73^abx            | 5.62^abxy                        | 5.53^abxy                        |
|                | 100                 | 5.43^bx             | 5.01^by                          | 4.63^by                          |
|                | 200                 | 4.73^bx             | 4.23^by                          | 3.64^a                           |
| Shaking        | Control             | 5.83^a              | 5.74^a                           | 5.85^a                           |
|                | 50                  | 3.49^d              | ND                               | ND                               |
|                | 100                 | 2.41^e              | ND                               | ND                               |
|                | 200                 | 1.29^f              | ND                               | ND                               |

^a^ Means in the same column followed by different superscripts are significantly different at P < 0.05 (Duncan’s multiple range test).
^x–z^ Means in the same row followed by different superscripts are significantly different at P < 0.05 (Duncan’s multiple range test).

Table 4: Coliform reduction of tilapia fillets disinfected by soaking or shaking treatments at different chlorine dioxide concentrations.

| Wash method | Concentration (ppm) | Cleaning time (min) | Coliforms log (CFU/g) |
|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|             |                     | 5                   | 15                    | 25                    |
| Soaking     | Control             | 5.23^a              | 5.33^a                | 5.21^a                |
|             | 50                  | 4.80^b              | 3.22^b                | 4.06^by              |
|             | 100                 | 4.17^c              | 2.33^c                | ND                   |
|             | 200                 | 3.23^d              | 1.23^d                | ND                   |
| Shaking     | Control             | 5.23^a              | 5.29^a                | 5.25^aa              |
|             | 50                  | 1.78^e              | ND                   | ND                   |
|             | 100                 | 1.07^f              | ND                   | ND                   |
|             | 200                 | ND                  | ND                   | ND                   |

^a–f^ Means in the same column followed by different superscripts are significantly different at P < 0.05 (Duncan’s multiple range test).
^x–z^ Means in the same row followed by different superscripts are significantly different at P < 0.05 (Duncan’s multiple range test).

Explanations could be that the Cl₂ is not as effective as ClO₂, because active oxygen molecules diminish the number of electrons on biological cell membranes and cause damage to biological enzymes on biological membranes therefore amino acid and nucleic bodies are hindered from generating proteins in biological cells [33, 35, 36]. Another reason could be that ClO₂ not only reacts with electrons on biological cell membranes but also reacts with Cl₂ to achieve disassociation and oxidation under an acidic condition and then forms ClO₂⁻, ClO₃⁻, and Cl⁻ byproducts [21, 33]. The less Cl₂ there was, the higher the disinfection effect was.

3.3. Effect of Various Treatments. Three different concentrations (50, 100, and 200 ppm) of 99% ClO₂ solutions were used for soaking or shaking disinfection treatment on tilapia fillets for 5, 15, and 25 min. Results are shown in Table 3. After the fish fillets were shaken in the solutions for 5 min, total plate counts were 3.49, 2.41, and 1.29 log CFU/g, respectively, and all were nondetectable after 15 and 25 min, compared to the control groups at 5.84~5.78 log CFU/g (control).

Similar results for coliforms and E. coli are shown in Tables 4 and 5. The control groups of coliform (control) were 5.23, 5.29, and 5.25 CFU/g. When tilapia fillets were treated with 50, 100, and 200 ppm of high-purity ClO₂ solutions with the shaking method for 5 min, the coliform counts, respectively, decreased to 1.78, 1.07 log CFU/g, and nondetectable (Table 4). Escherichia coli also showed a >4 log reduction after 5 min and was nondetectable after 15 and 25 min of shaking (Table 5). Both the soaking and shaking methods eliminated microbial populations; however, the results show that the soaking method was not as effective as the shaking method. Microorganisms attached to fish skin may more easily be washed out by shaking with mechanical forces [37]. Aloisio and Francisco [38] claimed that ClO₂ being bound to water molecules by static attraction forces under a steady state hindered the bactericidal effect.

3.4. Detection of THMs. THM residuals are a problem for the safety of chlorine-treated food materials [39, 40]. After tilapia fillets were washed by soaking or shaking in the ClO₂ solution with the highest concentration (200 ppm) for 25 min, the waste solutions were analyzed for THMs using GC/MS. THMs include chloroform, dichloromethane, and methyl chloride. The results show that no THMs were detected in a used ClO₂ solution after soaking (GC-MS detection limit was 0.12 ppb), as shown in Table 6. These results conform to Taiwan’s environmental protection regulations and act governing food sanitation. Furthermore, a LC-MS analysis
Table 5: *Escherichia coli* reduction of tilapia fillets disinfected by soaking or shaking treatments at different chlorine dioxide concentrations.

| Wash method | Concentration (ppm) | 5 min | 15 min | 25 min |
|-------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Control     |                     | 5.23<sup>ax</sup> | 5.33<sup>ax</sup> | 5.22<sup>ax</sup> |
| 50          |                     | 3.08<sup>bx</sup> | 2.21<sup>by</sup> | 1.14<sup>cz</sup> |
| 100         |                     | 2.25<sup>cx</sup> | ND     | ND     |
| 200         |                     | 1.13<sup>d</sup> | ND     | ND     |

Soaking

| Concentration (ppm) | Cleaning time (min) |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Control             |                     |
| 50                  |                     |
| 100                 |                     |
| 200                 |                     |

Shaking

| Concentration (ppm) | Cleaning time (min) |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Control             |                     |
| 50                  |                     |
| 100                 |                     |
| 200                 |                     |

<sup>ax-d</sup> Means in the same column followed by different superscripts are significantly different at *P* < 0.05 (Duncan’s multiple range test).

<sup>x-z</sup> Means in the same row followed by different superscripts are significantly different at *P* < 0.05 (Duncan’s multiple range test).

Table 6: Total trihalomethane (THM) residuals by GC/MS.

| Item          | Total trihalomethane<sup>a</sup> (ppb) |
|---------------|----------------------------------------|
| Methyl chloride | ND                                     |
| Dichloromethane | ND                                     |
| Chloroform    | ND                                     |

<sup>a</sup> The instrument detection limit was 0.12 ppb.

also showed that when using a 200 ppm bactericide solution for 25 min at 25°C, residual of ClO<sub>2</sub> solution was no detected in solution (the instrument detection limit was 0.1 ppb).

4. Conclusions

The results demonstrated the feasibility of stably producing ClO<sub>2</sub> using electrochemical technology. The maximum concentration and purity of ClO<sub>2</sub> were obtained when using a mixture that blended 20% NaCl and 7%~10% NaClO<sub>2</sub> together as the electrolytes. The concentration and purity of ClO<sub>2</sub> were 3200~4700 ppm and 99.5~99.7%, respectively. Disinfection results indicate that a 200 ppm ClO<sub>2</sub> solution reduced the total bacterial, coliform, and *E. coli* counts on tilapia fillets by 3.0~4.0 log CFU/g (*P* < 0.05). The soaking wash treatment was more effective than the shaking method.

A GC-MS analysis also showed that when using a 200 ppm bactericide solution for 25 min, residual THMs of the ClO<sub>2</sub> solution were nondetectable. Bactericidal treatment with a ClO<sub>2</sub> solution for tilapia fillets also conforms to Taiwan’s environmental protection regulations and act governing food sanitation. The ClO<sub>2</sub> solution is indeed a safer method for treating seafood, and our novel electrolysis equipment can produce highly purified, low-cost ClO<sub>2</sub> to disinfect with water, for immediate use for agricultural product and seafood treatment.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

Acknowledgment

This work was financially supported by the Council of Agriculture of Taiwan under Grant no. 97AS-1.2.1-ST-A3.

References

[1] Q. Ma, B. Li, C. Wang, Y. Ji, S. Wang, and W. Cao, “Efficiency of electrolyzed oxidizing water for inactivation of salmonella spp. and inoculated shell eggs,” *International Journal of Food Engineering*, vol. 5, no. 3, article 3, 2009.

[2] Z. Liu, Y. Dong, and W. Jiang, “Decontamination efficiency of slightly acidic electrolyzed water on fresh-cut cucumbers,” *International Journal of Food Engineering*, vol. 7, no. 5, article 13, 2011.

[3] L. M. Friedrich, R. Goodrich-Schneider, M. E. Parish, and M. D. Danyluk, “Mitigation of *Alicyclobacillus* spp. spores on food contact surfaces with aqueous chlorine dioxide and hypochlorite,” *Food Microbiology*, vol. 26, no. 8, pp. 936–941, 2009.

[4] R. Vaid, R. H. Linton, and M. T. Morgan, “Comparison of inactivation of *Listeria monocytogenes* within a biofilm matrix using chlorine dioxide gas, aqueous chlorine dioxide and sodium hypochlorite treatments,” *Food Microbiology*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 979–984, 2010.

[5] C. D. Cruz and G. C. Fletcher, “Assessing manufacturers’ recommended concentrations of commercial sanitizers on inactivation of *Listeria monocytogenes*,” *Food Control*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 194–199, 2012.

[6] H. Gallard and U. Von Gunten, “Chlorination of natural organic matter: kinetics of chlorination and of THM formation,” *Water Research*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 65–74, 2002.

[7] S. Sorlini and C. Collivignarelli, “Trihalomethane formation during chemical oxidation with chlorine, chlorine dioxide and ozone of ten Italian natural waters,” *Desalination*, vol. 176, no. 1–3, pp. 103–111, 2005.

[8] M. K. Rameiser, A. Peter, J. Traber, and U. von Gunten, “Formation of assimilable organic carbon during oxidation of natural waters with ozone, chlorine dioxide, chlorine, permanganate, and ferrate,” *Water Research*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 2002–2010, 2011.

[9] S. D. Richardson, “Drinking water disinfection byproducts,” in *The Encyclopedia of Environmental Analysis and Remediation*,
R. A. Meyers, Ed., pp. 1398–1421, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, USA, 1998.

[10] Ch. Rav-Acha, A. Serri, E. G. Choshen, and B. Limoni, “Disinfection of drinking water rich in bromide with chlorine and chlorine dioxide, while minimizing the formation of undesirable by-products,” Water Science and Technology, vol. 17, no. 4-5, pp. 611–621, 1985.

[11] J. M. Kim, T.-S. Huang, M. R. Marshall, and C.-I. Wei, “Chlorine dioxide treatment of seafoods to reduce bacterial loads,” Journal of Food Science, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 1089–1093, 1999.

[12] W.-F. Lin, T.-S. Huang, J. A. Cornell, C.-M. Lin, and C.-I. Wei, “Bactericidal activity of aqueous chlorine and chlorine dioxide solutions in a fish model system,” Journal of Food Science, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 1030–1034, 1996.

[13] S. Zhang and J. M. Farber, “The effects of various disinfectants against Listeria monocytogenes on fresh-cut vegetables,” Food Microbiology, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 311–321, 1996.

[14] I. H. Chen, T. S. Huang, J. Kim et al., “The bactericidal effect of chlorine dioxide against E. coli O157: H7, Listeria monocytogenes, and Salmonella spp. inoculated on strawberries, cucumbers, and cantaloupes,” in Proceedings of the Institute of Food Technology Annual Meeting, Abstract 78F-22, Dallas, Tex, USA, 2000.

[15] Y. Han, T. L. Selby, K. K. Schultz, P. E. Nelson, and R. H. Linton, “Decontamination of strawberries using batch and continuous chlorine dioxide gas treatments,” Journal of Food Protection, vol. 67, no. 11, pp. 2450–2455, 2004.

[16] S.-Y. Lee, M. Costello, and D.-H. Kang, “Efficacy of chlorine dioxide gas as a sanitizer of lettuce leaves,” Journal of Food Protection, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 1371–1376, 2004.

[17] C. C. Chung, T. C. Huang, C. H. Yu, F. Y. Shen, and H. H. Chen, “Bactericidal effects of fresh-cut vegetables and fruits after subsequent washing with chlorine dioxide,” International Proceedings of Chemical, Biological & Environmental Engineering, vol. 9, article 21, pp. 107–112, 2011.

[18] W. J. Masschelein, “Experience with chlorine dioxide in Brussel: generation of chlorine dioxide,” Journal American Water Works Association, vol. 76, no. 1, pp. 70–76, 1984.

[19] P. Westerhoff, P. Chao, and H. Mash, “Reactivity of natural organic matter with aqueous chlorine and bromine,” Water Research, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 1502–1513, 2004.

[20] R. W. Jordon, A. J. Kosinski, and R. J. Baker, “Improved method generates more chlorine dioxide,” Water & Sewage Works, vol. 127, no. 10, pp. 44–46, 1980.

[21] E. M. Aietta and J. D. Berg, “A review of chlorine dioxide in drinking water treatment,” Journal American Water Works Association, vol. 78, no. 6, pp. 62–72, 1986.

[22] G. Gordon and B. Bubnis, “Ozone and chlorine dioxide: similar chemistry and measurement issues,” Ozone Science and Engineering, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 447–464, 1999.

[23] B. R. Deshwal and H.-K. Lee, “Kinetics and mechanism of chlorine based chlorine dioxide generation process from acidic sodium chlorate,” Journal of Hazardous Materials, vol. 108, no. 3, pp. 173–182, 2004.

[24] G. Petrucci and M. Rosellini, “Chlorine dioxide in seawater for fouling control and post-disinfection in potable waterworks,” Desalination, vol. 182, no. 1-3, pp. 283–291, 2005.

[25] H. Bergmann and S. Koparal, “The formation of chlorine dioxide in the electrochemical treatment of drinking water for disinfection,” Electrochimica Acta, vol. 50, no. 25-26, pp. 5218–5228, 2005.

[26] Y. Qian, Y. Chen, Y. Jiang, and L. Zhang, “A clean production process of sodium chlorite from sodium chlorate,” Journal of Cleaner Production, vol. 15, no. 10, pp. 920–926, 2007.

[27] H. H. Chen, T. C. Huang, and R. J. Tung, “Chlorine dioxide electrolysis equipment,” Inventors: National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, assignee, Taiwan Patent, no. 200722557, December 2005.

[28] L. Wang, J. L. Huang, and H. B. Li, “Determination of ClO2, ClO2− and ClO2− in water by using continuous iodimetry,” Journal of Harbin University of Civil Engineering and Architecture, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 70–75, 1997.

[29] CNS, “Method of Test for Food Microbiology-Test of Standard Plate Count,” General No 10890. Classified No N6186, 1991.

[30] S. Suwansomthichai and S. Rengpipat, “Enumeration of coliforms and Escherichia coli in frozen black tiger shrimp Penaeus monodon by conventional and rapid methods,” International Journal of Food Microbiology, vol. 81, no. 2, pp. 113–121, 2003.

[31] M. A. Stack, G. Fitzgerald, S. O’Connell, and K. J. James, “Measurement of trihalomethanes in potable and recreational waters using solid phase micro extraction with gas chromatography-mass spectrometry,” Chemosphere, vol. 41, no. 11, pp. 1821–1826, 2000.

[32] S. A. S. Institute, “User’s Guide: Statistics,” Ver. 6.4, SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA, 1990.

[33] H. Junli, W. Li, R. Nanqi, M. Fang, and J. Juli, “Disinfection effect of chlorine dioxide on bacteria in water,” Water Research, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 607–613, 1997.

[34] G. L. Amy, J. Debroux, S. Sinha, P. Brandhuber, and J. Chao, “Occurrence of disinfection by-products (DBPs) precursors in source waters and DBPs in finished Waters,” in Proceedings of the 4th International Workshop on Drinking Waters Quality Management and Treatment Technology, pp. 59–70, Taipei, Taiwan, 1998.

[35] N. Singh, R. K. Singh, A. K. Bhunia, and R. L. Stroshine, “Efficacy of chlorine dioxide, ozone, and thyme essential oil or a sequential washing in killing Escherichia coli O157: H7 on lettuce and baby carrots,” LWT—Food Science and Technology, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 720–729, 2002.

[36] L. R. Beuchat, C. A. Pettigrew, M. E. Tremblay, B. J. Roselle, and A. J. Scouten, “Leathality of chlorine, chlorine dioxide, and a commercial fruit and vegetable sanitizer to vegetative cells and spores of Bacillus cereus and spores of Bacillus thuringiensis,” Journal of Industrial Microbiology and Biotechnology, vol. 32, no. 7, pp. 301–308, 2005.

[37] C.-S. Lin, C. Wu, J.-Y. Yeh, and F. K. Saalia, “The evaluation of electrolysed water as an agent for reducing micro-organisms on vegetables,” International Journal of Food Science and Technology, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 495–500, 2005.

[38] F. Aloisio and J. S. Francisco, “A density functional study of H2O-OClO, (H2O)2-OClO and H2O-CIO2 complexes,” Chemical Physics, vol. 254, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2000.

[39] G. P. Li and H. L. Xia, “Review on the application of chlorine dioxide in food sterilization and disinfection,” Food Science and Technology, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 21–25, 2006.

[40] S. Q. Hu and R. Y. Jin, “Research on sterilization of chlorine dioxide gas and its application perspective,” China Safety Science Journal, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 153–155, 2007.