1 Is the Current N95 Respirator Filtration Efficiency Test Sufficient for Evaluating

- 2 Protection Against Submicrometer Particles Containing SARS-CoV-2?
- 3

4 Changjie Cai^{1,*}, Evan L. Floyd¹, Kathleen A. Aithinne¹, Toluwanimi Oni¹

- ¹Department of Occupational and Environmental Health, University of Oklahoma
- 6 Health Sciences Center, University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73104,
- 7 USA
- 8
- 9 To be submitted to:
- 10 Revised on June 8, 2020
- 11

12 Abstract

The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health procedure No. TEB-13 APR-STP-0059 recommend of measuring the respirator filtration efficiency using 14 sodium chloride aerosol with count median diameter of 75 nm \pm 20 nm and geometric 15 standard deviation \leq 1.86. This study showed that this method would overestimate the 16 respirators' ability to protect against submicrometer particles. In this study, we 17 converted both mobility diameter and equivalent volume diameter to aerodynamic 18 diameter for comparison. The results showed that one unqualified KN95 respirator 19 (with the filtration efficiency of $72\% \pm 3\%$ for ≥ 300 nm sodium chloride aerosol) still 20 passed the test with a measured overall filtration efficiency of 98%±3%, due to its larger 21 most penetrating particle size compared to the typical N95 respirator. In addition, after 22 three cycle H₂O₂ plasma vaporous sterilizations, the most penetrating particle size for 23 24 the N95 grade respirators also shifted to 250 nm - 500 nm, in which size the particles 25 NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by neer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26	the significant difference between the size specific (250 nm - 500 nm) filtration
27	efficiency and overall filtration efficiency using the same NaCl test aerosol. For
28	example, after three cycle H ₂ O ₂ plasma vaporous sterilizations, the size specific
29	filtration efficiency of the N95 was 55%±2%, however, the measured overall filtration
30	efficiency was still 86%±5%. The size Specific filtration efficiency of the KN95 was
31	$69\%\pm2\%$, but, the measured overall filtration efficiency was still $90\%\pm3\%$. In order to
32	protect health care personnel adequately, we recommend increasing the test aerosol size,
33	and measuring the size specific filtration efficiency to evaluate the N95 alternatives (e.g.
34	KN95), and the reuse of N95 level respirators. In addition, multi-cycle sterilization
35	with ultraviolet germicidal irradiation appears to have fewer negative effects than H_2O_2 .
36	
37	Keywords: N95, KN95, Size Specific Filtration Efficiency, Overall Filtration

Efficiency, Submicrometer Particles, SARS-CoV-2

1. Introduction 40

61

41	Recent studies indicates that aerosol transmission of the severe acute respiratory
42	syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is plausible since the virus can remain viable and
43	infectious in aerosol form for hours ($\underline{1},\underline{2}$). Wearing personal protective equipment (e.g. N95
44	respirator) could be an effective strategy before the effective vaccines or antiviral drugs. The
45	N95 grade respirator should have a minimum filtration efficiency of 95% for ≥300 nm
46	(aerodynamic diameter) sodium chloride (NaCl) aerosols. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic
47	and shortage of mask supplies (3) , some studies analyzed the reuse of N95/KN95 respirators
48	after sterilization by measuring the filtration efficiency using NaCl test aerosol ($4, 5$).
49	However, in the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) National Institute of
50	Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) procedure No. TEB-APR-STP-0059, the count
51	median diameter (CMD) of the NaCl test aerosol is 75 nm \pm 20 nm with the geometric
52	standard deviation (GSD) \leq 1.86, which might be too small compared to the particles
53	containing infectious agents.
54	The peak concentration of the SARS-CoV-2 in hospitals was found in $250 \text{ nm} - 500$
55	nm (aerodynamic diameter) particles (6), although the actual SARS-CoV-2 size ranges only
56	from 60 nm $-$ 150 nm (<u>7,8,9</u>). Since the most penetrating particle size (MPPS) for typical
57	N95 respirators is 30 nm – 100 nm (10), the CDC NIOSH recommends using the NaCl test
58	aerosol with a CMD of 75 nm \pm 20 nm and GSD of \leq 1.86. However, using this size NaCl
59	test aerosol means that around 89.9% particles are ≤ 250 nm (aerodynamic diameter), which is
60	not in the particle size range of containing the peak concentration of the SARS-CoV-2 in
61	hospitals. The light-scattering instruments (e.g., aerosol photometer), which are commonly

62	used for filtration efficiency test, are usually limited to measuring aerosol larger than 100 nm
63	(11); still around 84.6% particles are \leq 250 nm (aerodynamic diameter) if a photometer is
64	used during the test. Therefore, a respirator efficient for particles ≤ 250 nm may not capture
65	most SARS-CoV-2, and the size specific filtration efficiency is a better assessment of the
66	respirator's protection ability rather than the overall filtration efficiency to prevent the SARS-
67	CoV-2 transmit via airborne particles.
68	The goal of this demonstration study was to compare the size specific filtration
69	efficiency to the overall filtration efficiency through testing an untreated (new) KN95, and
70	treated (multiple sterilization cycles) KN95/N95 respirators.
71	
72	2. Methods
72 73	2. Methods2.1 Experimental Setup
72 73 74	 2. Methods 2.1 Experimental Setup We tested KN95 respirators from over 20 various manufacturers, and selected two of
72 73 74 75	2. Methods 2.1 Experimental Setup We tested KN95 respirators from over 20 various manufacturers, and selected two of them (one qualified and one unqualified) for analysis in this study. We analyzed the reasons
72 73 74 75 76	2. Methods 2.1 Experimental Setup We tested KN95 respirators from over 20 various manufacturers, and selected two of them (one qualified and one unqualified) for analysis in this study. We analyzed the reasons why the unqualified KN95 respirator (Nine Particles Medical Equipment Co, Ltd, Yongzhou,
72 73 74 75 76 77	2. Methods 2.1 Experimental Setup We tested KN95 respirators from over 20 various manufacturers, and selected two of them (one qualified and one unqualified) for analysis in this study. We analyzed the reasons why the unqualified KN95 respirator (Nine Particles Medical Equipment Co, Ltd, Yongzhou, Hunan, China) still passed the test using the NIOSH recommended NaCl test aerosol. We
72 73 74 75 76 77 78	2. Methods 2. Methods 2.1 Experimental Setup We tested KN95 respirators from over 20 various manufacturers, and selected two of them (one qualified and one unqualified) for analysis in this study. We analyzed the reasons why the unqualified KN95 respirator (Nine Particles Medical Equipment Co, Ltd, Yongzhou, Hunan, China) still passed the test using the NIOSH recommended NaCl test aerosol. We also compared the effects of two- and three-cycle sterilization using vaporous plasma
72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79	2. Methods 2. Methods 2.1 Experimental Setup We tested KN95 respirators from over 20 various manufacturers, and selected two of them (one qualified and one unqualified) for analysis in this study. We analyzed the reasons why the unqualified KN95 respirator (Nine Particles Medical Equipment Co, Ltd, Yongzhou, Hunan, China) still passed the test using the NIOSH recommended NaCl test aerosol. We also compared the effects of two- and three-cycle sterilization using vaporous plasma hydrogen peroxide (H ₂ O ₂) and ultraviolet (UV) germicidal irradiation on the filtration
72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80	2. Methods 2.1 Experimental Setup We tested KN95 respirators from over 20 various manufacturers, and selected two of them (one qualified and one unqualified) for analysis in this study. We analyzed the reasons why the unqualified KN95 respirator (Nine Particles Medical Equipment Co, Ltd, Yongzhou, Hunan, China) still passed the test using the NIOSH recommended NaCl test aerosol. We also compared the effects of two- and three-cycle sterilization using vaporous plasma hydrogen peroxide (H ₂ O ₂) and ultraviolet (UV) germicidal irradiation on the filtration efficiencies by size of KN95 (qualified one from Civilian Antivirus, Qingdao, Shandong,
72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81	2. Methods 2.1 Experimental Setup We tested KN95 respirators from over 20 various manufacturers, and selected two of them (one qualified and one unqualified) for analysis in this study. We analyzed the reasons why the unqualified KN95 respirator (Nine Particles Medical Equipment Co, Ltd, Yongzhou, Hunan, China) still passed the test using the NIOSH recommended NaCl test aerosol. We also compared the effects of two- and three-cycle sterilization using vaporous plasma hydrogen peroxide (H ₂ O ₂) and ultraviolet (UV) germicidal irradiation on the filtration efficiencies by size of KN95 (qualified one from Civilian Antivirus, Qingdao, Shandong, China) and N95 (model 1860, 3M, St Paul, MN, USA) respirator. The experimental setup

83 Nebulizer (3 jet, CH Technologies, Westwood, NJ, USA) operated at 20 psi using 2% NaCl

- 84 aerosol recommended by NIOSH procedure No. TEB-APR-STP-0059. We tested five
- samples for each respirator. A scanning mobility particle sizer (SMPS, model 3936, TSI Inc.,
- 86 Shoreview, MN, USA) was used to measure the number concentration of test aerosol from
- 16.8 nm to 514 nm up and down stream of each sample. We conducted a two-sample t-test
- (with $\alpha = 0.05$ as significance threshold) to compare the mean filtration efficiency of the five
- samples at each aerosol size between two and three sterilization cycles.

90 2.2 Diameter Conversion

91 In this study, we converted both mobility diameter and equivalent volume diameter to 92 aerodynamic diameter for comparison. The equations are from literature (*13*, *14*):

93
$$\frac{d_m}{Cc(d_m)} = \frac{d_{ve}\chi_t}{Cc(d_{ve})}$$

where d_m and d_{ve} are mobility diameter and volume equivalent diameter, respectively; $Cc(d_m)$ and $Cc(d_{ve})$ are the respective slip correction factors for d_m and d_{ve} ; χ_t is the dynamic shape factor in transition regime.

97
$$d_a = d_{ve} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\chi} \frac{\rho_p}{\rho_0} \frac{Cc(d_{ve})}{Cc(d_a)}}$$

98 where d_a is aerodynamic diameter; ρ_p and ρ_0 are particle density and standard density (1g cm⁻ 99 ³), respective; $Cc(d_a)$ is the slip correction factors for d_a ; χ is the dynamic shape factor. The 100 salt aerosol density is 1.75 - 1.99 g cm⁻³, and the dynamic shape factor is 1.05 - 1.14 from 101 measurements (*15*). Therefore, we assumed the salt aerosol density of 1.8 g cm⁻³ and shape 102 factor of 1.1 in this study.

103 **3. Results**

104 **3.1 Effects of test aerosol size on filtration efficiency**

- 105 We found an interesting case for an unqualified KN95 shown in **Figure 1**. The results
- showed that the respirator passed the filtration efficiency test with an overall filtration
- efficiency of $98\pm3\%$, and an acceptable pressure drop of $0.173 \text{ "wg} \pm 0.015 \text{ "wg}$ (Figure 1a).
- 108 However, by looking at the filtration efficiency by aerosol size, this respirator is not qualified
- as a N95 grade respirator since the filtration efficiency for particles \geq 300 nm is 72% \pm 3%,
- 110 which is much lower than a minimum of 95% (**Figure 1b**).
- 111



112

Figure 1. Test of an unqualified KN95 respirator: (a) overall filtration efficiency & pressure
 drop test, and (b) filtration efficiency by aerosol size.

115

We conducted a sensitivity study of estimating the overall filtration efficiency by increasing the CMD from 55 nm (79 nm equivalent count median aerodynamic diameter,

- 118 CMAD) to 215 nm (278 nm equivalent CMAD) (Figure 2). The results indicated that the
- overall filtration efficiency would gradually decrease from 97% to 82% by increasing the test
- aerosol CMAD from 79 nm to 278 nm.



121



Figure 2. Effects of the test aerosol size on the overall filtration efficiency.

123

124 **3.2 Effects of multi-cycle sterilization on the filtration efficiency**

125	The effects of multi-cycle sterilization on the filtration efficiency by aerosol size are
126	summarized in Figure 3. After three H ₂ O ₂ sterilization cycles, the filtration efficiency for
127	250 nm – 500 nm particles dropped from 84% \pm 2% to 69% \pm 2% for KN95, and from 97% \pm 2%
128	to $55\% \pm 2\%$ for N95. The differences between two and three cycles were significant for both
129	KN95 (p -value = 0.014±0.014) and N95 (p -value = 0.0009±0.0008). After UV sterilization,
130	the filtration efficiency of KN95 for 250 nm $-$ 500 nm particles was 94.4% ± 1.0 % after two
131	cycles, and $95.0\% \pm 0.6\%$ after three cycles; and the filtration efficiency of N95 was
132	$95.9\% \pm 1.4\%$ after two cycles, and $96.9\% \pm 0.7\%$ after three cycles. The differences were not
133	statistically significant between two and three cycles for both KN95 (<i>p</i> -value = 0.852 ± 0.093)

134 and N95 (*p*-value = 0.448 ± 0.267).

135



136

Figure 3. Effects of multi-cycle sterilization on filtration efficiency by aerosol size using

138

 H_2O_2 and UV treatment for (a) N95, and (b) KN9.



Respirator Type	H_2O_2	Overall Filtration	Size Specific
	Treatment	Efficiency	Filtration Efficiency
KN95 – Civilian Antivirus	2 Cycle	93%±3%	84%±1%
	3 Cycle	90%±3%	69%±2%
N95 – 3M 1860	2 Cycle	98%±1%	97%±1%
	3 Cycle	86%±5%	55%±2%

141 filtration efficiency after multi-cycle H₂O₂ treatment.

142

The size specific filtration efficiency is quite different from the overall filtration 143 efficiency, especially after three cycle H_2O_2 treatment (see **Table 1**). For instance, the overall 144 filtration efficiencies for KN95 and N95 after three cycle H_2O_2 treatment are 90%±3% and 145 $86\% \pm 5\%$, respectively; however, the size specific filtration efficiencies are only $69\% \pm 2\%$ for 146 KN95 and $55\% \pm 2\%$ for N95, respectively. The big difference between the size specific 147 filtration efficiency and the overall filtration efficiency might be due to the MPPS shift after 148 three cycle H_2O_2 treatment. The MPPS shifted from nanoparticle sizes (see Figure 4) to 149 submicrometer particle sizes (see Figure 3), which are not the majority of the NaCl test aerosol 150 size. 151





Figure 4. The most penetrating particle size (MPPS) for an untreated 3M N95 (new)

154

155 4. Discussion

This study proposed that the current NaCl test aerosol size might need to be increased 156 for testing the new KN95 respirator, and the reuse of N95 level respirators after sterilizations 157 due to their much larger MPPS compared to traditional N95 respirators'. In addition to 158 considering the overall filtration efficiency, the filtration efficiencies for particle sizes similar 159 to infectious particles should be considered. This study also found that the two different 160 multi-cycle sterilization processes have unique effects on the filtration efficiencies by aerosol 161 size of different respirators. Multi-cycle sterilization with UV appears to have fewer negative 162 effects than H₂O₂. Limitations include the small variety of respirator manufacturers and the 163 limited numbers of samples (n=5) for each respirator and only two sterilization techniques 164 evaluated. In addition, this study only evaluated the filtration efficiency after three 165 sterilization cycles as this corresponds with guidance from the American College of Surgeons 166 for H₂O₂ sterilization. The filter material might degrade further with more cycles, which 167

should be investigated for UV treatment.

169

170 Acknowledgement

- 171 This work was made possible by support from the Oklahoma State Department of
- 172 Health to establish this testing program, by the supply chain logistics group at the University
- 173 of Oklahoma Medical Center who provided the respirators and sterilization treatments, by the
- 174 University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center VPR's office through a COVID19 Rapid
- 175 Response pilot grant, and by the student volunteers that assisted with data collection.

177 **References**

178	1.	van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson
179		BN, et al. Aerosol and surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 as compared with SARS-
180		CoV-1. New England Journal of Medicine. 2020; DOI: 10.1056/NEJMc2004973
181	2.	Asadi S, Bouvier N, Wexler AS, & Ristenpart WD. The coronavirus pandemic and
182		aerosols: Does COVID-19 transmit via expiratory particles? Aerosol Science and
183		Technology, 2020; 54(6), 635-638.
184	3.	Ranney ML, Griffeth V, Jha AK. Critical Supply Shortages — The Need for
185		Ventilators and Personal Protective Equipment during the Covid-19 Pandemic. New
186		England Journal of Medicine. 2020; DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp2006141
187	4.	Viscusi DJ, Bergman MS, Eimer BC, & Shaffer RE. Evaluation of five
188		decontamination methods for filtering facepiece respirators. Annals of occupational
189		hygiene. 2009; 53(8), 815-827.
190	5.	Liao L, Xiao W, Zhao M, Yu X, Wang H, Wang Q, et al. Can N95 respirators be
191		reused after disinfection? And for how many times?. ACS nano. 2020; 14(5), 6348-
192		6356.
193	6.	Liu Y, Ning Z, Chen Y, Guo M, Liu Y, Gali NK, et al. Aerodynamic analysis of
194		SARS-CoV-2 in two Wuhan hospitals. Nature. 2020; https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-
195		020-2271-3
196	7.	Kim JM, Chung YS, Jo HJ, Lee NJ, Kim MS, Woo SH, et al. Identification of
197		Coronavirus Isolated from a Patient in Korea with COVID-19. Osong Public Health
198		and Research Perspectives. 2020; 11(1), 3.

199	8.	Cascella M, Rajnik M, Cuomo A, Dulebohn SC, & Di Napoli R. Features, evaluation
200		and treatment coronavirus (COVID-19). In Statpearls [internet]. StatPearls
201		Publishing. 2020
202	9.	Matsuyama S, Nao N, Shirato K, Kawase M, Saito S, Takayama I, et al. Enhanced
203		isolation of SARS-CoV-2 by TMPRSS2-expressing cells. Proceedings of the National
204		Academy of Sciences. 2020; 117(13), 7001-7003.
205	10	Shaffer, R. E., & Rengasamy, S. Respiratory protection against airborne
206		nanoparticles: a review. Journal of nanoparticle research. 2009; 11(7), 1661.
207	11.	Eninger, R. M., Honda, T., Reponen, T., McKay, R., & Grinshpun, S. A. What does
208		respirator certification tell us about filtration of ultrafine particles?. Journal of
209		occupational and environmental hygiene. 2008; 5(5), 286-295.
210	12	Cai C, Floyd E. Effects of Sterilization With Hydrogen Peroxide and Chlorine
211		Dioxide on the Filtration Efficiency of N95, KN95, and Surgical Face Masks. 2020;
212		(accepted)
213	13	DeCarlo, P. F., Slowik, J. G., Worsnop, D. R., Davidovits, P., & Jimenez, J. L.
214		Particle morphology and density characterization by combined mobility and
215		aerodynamic diameter measurements. Part 1: Theory. Aerosol Science and
216		Technology. 2004; 38(12), 1185-1205.
217	14	Hinds, W. C. Aerosol technology: properties, behavior, and measurement of airborne
218		particles. John Wiley & Sons. 1999.

- 15. Kuwata, M., & Kondo, Y. (2011). Measurements of particle masses of inorganic salt
- 220 particles for calibration of cloud condensation nuclei counters. Inorganic Chemistry:
- Reactions, Structure and Mechanisms. 2011; 239.

222

224 Figure/Table Legends

- Figure 1. Test of an unqualified KN95 respirator: (a) overall filtration efficiency & pressure
- drop test, and (b) filtration efficiency by aerosol size.
- Figure 2. Effects of the test aerosol size on the overall filtration efficiency.
- **Figure 3.** Effects of multi-cycle sterilization on filtration efficiency by aerosol size using
- H_2O_2 and UV treatment for (a) N95, and (b) KN9.
- **Figure 4.** The most penetrating particle size (MPPS) for an untreated 3M N95 (new).
- **Table 1.** Comparison of overall filtration efficiency and size specific (250 nm 500 nm)
- 232 filtration efficiency after multi-cycle H_2O_2 treatment.