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My opinion

As interestingly brought to light by Svanes et al (2018) [1] and others [2-3], the time has been ripe for eliciting a discussion about the consequences of cleaning when with time, being too clean has been slowly replacing being too dirty [4-5]. To my limited understanding, the mechanical agents may elicit harm within moments and thus resolution against them may be successful within moments; the chemical agents may elicit harm within hours and thus their resolution may need more time; the biological agents may elicit harm within days and thus their recognition and thereafter their resolution may take longer times; and finally, the idiopathic (potentially psychological) agents may elicit harm within unknown time frames and consequently their resolution may spread over periods unknown. Hereafter, we can assume that workplaces like airports and hospitals [6-10], which may have been prone to be the most dangerous places in terms of transmitting diseases (biological agents) among the massive turnover of visitor populations' traffic harboring all types of contagions from all over the world, may have ended up achieving the tag of being the cleanest workplaces with the chemical agents (cleaning solutions) replacing the biological agents [11] at various points of contacts which are prone to be involved in humans-to-fomites-to-humans transmissions. Moreover, it may NOT be as much as the dusting off component of vacuum based often wet-cleaning but rather the spraying component of the cleaning solutions often "sitting on" (adhering to) the fomites waiting to be absorbed or adsorbed on to the next host body and in turn finding more often than not the bodies of cleaning solutions' dispersers (the cleaners) themselves. Even though the cleaning solutions' sprays may be replaced with cleaning solutions' sponges with the limitations and restrictions to be used only while donning the gloves along with the N95 respirators (masks) preventing the inhalation of 95% of small size inhalants [12] which are potentially evaporating while the recently cleansed surfaces are drying and turning/becoming to be odor-vapor-free, the human tendency to involuntarily touch mucosal surfaces of their faces with their hands [13] and contributing to transmissions of infectious agents (biological agents) may NOT differentiate much when translocating cleaning solutions (chemical agents) from their hands (even if they are gloved) to the mucosal surfaces of their faces and may thereafter raise the question whether it's time to re-explore if hot water or even cold water [14-15] cleansing may be sufficient enough for some surfaces to reduce humans’ exposures to chemical agents as replacements for biological agents in the modern much more clean though much more chemicalized existence for humans [16-17]. Interestingly, the cleaning additives which used to need hot water for better dissolution are no longer needing water to be heated up thus raising the question whether the chemical agents in cleaning additives have become more powerful (and potentially more harmful) when they are no longer needing water’s heat for dissolution/homogenization to make them work more effectively unless the cleaning additives irrespective of their affinity for cold or hot water may never be as harmless (and some may say pointless) as plain water itself. Summarily, the issues covertly inducted into readers’ minds by Svanes et al (2018) [1] should bring modern society more into action like some [18] wherein as simple an action as cleaning houses or offices may be evolving as detrimental to cleaners’ health warranting the need for guidelines about how to be safe without being too clean unless the society is sleeping while waiting to be shaken/awakened by overzealous/zealot litigating entities getting drawn on behalves of our insured healthcare costs and our protected occupational healthcare costs into these potentially lucrative avenues thus forcing our innocent hands into changing our cleaning practices and skills whether we are ourselves cleaning or are expecting others to clean our homes expectantly/domestically or our offices contractually/professionally.
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