

1 **Title: Heat treatment for reuse of disposable respirators during Covid-19 pandemic: Is**
2 **filtration and fit adversely affected?**

3 **Authors:** Miranda Loh¹, Ross Clark¹, John Cherrie^{1,2}

4 ¹Institute of Occupational Medicine, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

5 ²Institute of Biological Chemistry, Biophysics and Bioengineering, Heriot Watt University,
6 Riccarton, Edinburgh EH14 4AS, UK.

7 **Abstract:**

8 A number of methods for decontaminating disposable filtering face piece respirators have been
9 explored for use in health care settings during epidemics where respirators are in short supply, such as
10 the current Covid-19 pandemic. Heating to temperatures above 65°C has been shown to successfully
11 inactivate the SARS-CoV-2 virus on various surfaces. Ovens or similar heating devices are likely
12 already widely available in hospitals globally. We did a quantitative fit test on nine models of FFP2
13 and FFP3 respirators before and after heat treatment in an oven. These included both flat fold and
14 moulded cup styles. All passed the initial fit test, and all but two passed the post-treatment fit test.
15 This study demonstrates that FFP respirators can still retain both filtration efficiency and fit after wear
16 and heat treatment, but that it is necessary to understand the probability for failure of fit after
17 decontamination. Heat shows promise as a simple and effective way of treating FFP respirators.
18 Further evaluation of longer-term wear and disinfection effectiveness of heat treatment should be
19 done before widespread use.

20 **Keywords:** Respirator; Covid-19; filtering face piece; quantitative fit test; filtration efficiency; total
21 inward leakage; personal protective equipment; respiratory protective equipment

22

23

24

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **Introduction:**

26 The current Covid-19 pandemic is not only a public health crisis but also an occupational health
27 crisis; numerous countries face shortages of personal protective equipment (PPE). In healthcare
28 settings, disposable filtering face piece (FFP) respirators that have filtration efficiencies of 95% or
29 99% (N95 in USA and FFP3 in Europe, respectively) are needed for frontline workers treating
30 patients with Covid-19. The SARS-CoV-2 virus responsible for the disease can be shed and
31 transmitted through the respiratory route, especially in close contact, and therefore any shortage of
32 respiratory protective equipment (RPE) is detrimental to the health of frontline workers.

33 In the past, studies have explored methods for decontaminating and reusing FFP respirators, but this
34 has not been put into common practice (Heimbuch et al., 2011; Lindsley et al., 2015; Lore et al.,
35 2012; Viscusi et al., 2009). Now, numerous initiatives (“N95DECON - A scientific consortium for
36 data-driven study of N95 FFR decontamination,” 2020) are underway to determine the effectiveness
37 of decontamination methods in 1) disinfecting respirators and 2) maintaining both the filtration
38 efficiency and fit of the respirator. Respirators that meet filtration standards (N95 or FFP3) may still
39 not confer adequate protection due to inward leakage of a respirator poorly fitted to the wearer’s face
40 (Cherrie et al., 2018). Even fit-tested respirators may lose adequate fit after being worn, thus
41 disposable FFP respirators are normally meant for single use only. Retaining fit is as important to
42 maintaining RPE effectiveness as filtration for any decontamination method. Decontamination
43 methods that have been tested and found able to maintain FFP effectiveness without leaving a residue
44 that may be either a nuisance or hazardous to the wearer include UV germicidal irradiation (UVGI),
45 hydrogen peroxide vapour, and heat (CDC, 2020; “Decontamination Methods for 3M N95
46 Respirators,” 2020; Lindsley et al., 2015; Viscusi et al., 2009).

47 While effective, methods such as UVGI and hydrogen peroxide vapour may not be readily available
48 in a care facility. The SARS-CoV-2 virus has been shown to be rendered inactive at temperatures of
49 70°C (Chin et al., 2020). Heat is a relatively easy and accessible method of decontamination.
50 Filtration efficiency up to 110°C dry heat was still retained for three unused N95 models in one
51 experiment (Viscusi et al., 2009). However there is no information on how this affects total inward

52 leakage (which accounts for both filtration and fit) may be affected by heat. We tested a small set of
53 FFP respirators donated by hospitals and various other organisations to evaluate whether heat
54 treatment would adversely affect the ability of the respirator to pass a quantitative fit test after one
55 wear and subsequent heat treatment.

56 **Methods:**

57 Nine different respirator models were tested (Table 1), most of which were certified as FFP3. Due to
58 the lack of availability of FFP3 masks, some of the tested masks were FFP2 versions. One of each
59 type of respirator was tested, with the exception of one model, which was tested by two different
60 wearers. Each respirator was tested once by one of four wearers using the HSE INDG 479
61 (“Guidance on respiratory protective equipment (RPE) fit testing - INDG479,” 2019) and BSIF
62 Fit2Fit Companion Guide for Quantitative Fit Test protocol (“Fit2Fit Companion to HSE INDG479,”
63 n.d.) with a TSI PortaCount Pro+ 8038 (TSI Incorporated, Shoreview, MN USA), with a TSI Model
64 8026 Particle Generator which generates non-toxic NaCl particles. Three of the wearers were trained
65 fit testers and male. One tester was female, and not a trained tester. The test protocol included 84
66 seconds of each of the following activities in order, conducted while walking in place: normal
67 breathing; deep breathing; turning head side-to-side; nodding head up and down; reciting the rainbow
68 passage; bending over (standing); and normal breathing. The fit factor (FF) is the ratio of ambient air
69 particle concentration to in-respirator particle concentration and is calculated as:

$$70 \quad FF = \frac{C_B + C_A}{2C_R}$$

71 Where C_B = particle concentration in ambient air before respirator sample, C_A = particle concentration
72 in ambient air after respirator sample, C_R = particle concentration in respirator.

73 The pass level was set at FF=100 and the test was stopped once failure was detected.

74 After the first fit test, respirators were then placed in a drying oven with a target of 85 degrees for
75 approximately one hour, with a minimum of 30 minutes at the target temperature. Oven temperature
76 was set using an external calibrated temperature probe. Respirators were placed in nylon heat resistant

77 bags before placement in the oven. Two data logging temperature sensors (Hydrochron iButton®
78 DS1923; Maxim Integrated, San Jose, CA, USA) were placed in the bags with the respirators to check
79 the actual temperature in the vicinity of the respirator. The total time in the oven was generally about
80 an hour due to time to equilibration for the temperature probes.

81 After removal from the oven, the respirators were allowed to cool for at least half an hour before re-
82 test by the same wearer. Treatment generally occurred several hours to about a day after the initial
83 test. Overall fit factor was compared pre- and post- treatment. It should be noted that experience with
84 fit testing has shown that a degree of test-retest variability is to be expected and that this would be
85 encompassed by the re-test results here. However, such variation would be expected to be random
86 rather than systematic.

87 **Results:**

88 One respirator failed the initial pre-treatment fit test and was left out of the study. Two post-treatment
89 tests were failed, while all others passed (Figure 1). With the exception of one respirator (3M 8810),
90 all passing respirators had lower overall fit factors upon post-treatment tests. The reasonable
91 consistency in the direction of change suggests this is a real effect and not an artefact created by
92 random test-retest variability.

93 During one of the heat treatments, one of the temperature loggers read a maximum temperature of
94 65°C even as the other logger in the oven at the same time, read 86°C. This is likely to have affected
95 at least two respirators (Table 1).

96

97 **Discussion:**

98 We have examined the ability of FFP2/FFP3 respirators to pass a quantitative fit test after a single
99 wear and heat treatment. The heat treatments were all at or above temperatures shown in other studies
100 to deactivate the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Most respirators, of both flat fold and moulded cup style, were
101 able to pass a re-test.

102 In this study, because we were testing donated respirators, most of our wearers were not previously fit
103 tested for these respirators, with the exception of one. Although we did not test filtration efficiency
104 post-heat treatment, it is unlikely that this was adversely affected by the treatment, as most respirators
105 passed the second fit test. One of the respirator models that failed post-treatment fit test was duplicate
106 tested by a different wearer, who passed the post-treatment test, therefore the fit test failure was likely
107 due to alterations in fit, not filtration efficiency. In both failed fit tests post-treatment, visual
108 inspection of the respirators indicated that some physical aspect of the respirator was adversely
109 affected. For the 3M 1863 failure – the wearer had difficulty with refitting the nose clip the second
110 time. For the Alpha Solway S-3V failure – the foam gasket around the face seal appeared to be more
111 wrinkled and loose after the first wear. It is likely, therefore that impaired fit is responsible for both
112 these failures, rather than filtration efficiency.

113 The post-treatment fit tests tended to have a lower overall fit factor, indicating that there may be some
114 degradation, although this is not a large enough sample to determine whether this is a real effect or a
115 chance finding. Repeated treatments and fit tests on the same respirator would need to be done to
116 determine the likelihood that FFP respirators could be treated and re-used effectively multiple times.
117 Our study shows that it is possible to treat and re-use FFP respirators at least once, thus doubling the
118 potential numbers of respirator uses. This does not take into account any wear/deformation during
119 use that might impair the extent to which it can be re-used. For example, these tests were conducted
120 for a relatively short wear time, and in real use respirators may be worn for longer periods, and this
121 may also affect the reusability of the mask.

122 Finally, although we were able to show that FFP respirators can withstand heat treatment and still pass
123 a quantitative fit test, we did not test actual pathogen decontamination. Even if SARS-CoV-2 can be
124 successfully decontaminated at $<70^{\circ}\text{C}$, this does not mean that other pathogens or harmful microbes
125 are effectively deactivated. Future work should include a pathogen viability test, and a greater range
126 of temperatures. We were unable to measure humidity, and more controlled temperature/humidity
127 combinations should be tested to optimise both decontamination and preservation of respirator
128 effectiveness.

129 **Conclusions:**

130 Heat treatment at temperatures which inactivate the SARS-CoV-2 virus did not adversely affect
131 filtration or fit of most FFP2 or FFP3 respirators tested, although we acknowledge that there is still a
132 reasonable risk of fit failure. Heat could be a simple and inexpensive means to decontaminate
133 respirators, and further investigation is needed to understand the impact of repeated long wear-
134 decontamination-reuse cycles on respirator performance. Furthermore, we need to determine the
135 optimal temperature and humidity conditions for acceptable decontamination while still retaining
136 filtration and fit of the respirator. We strongly recommend that reuse of respirators, especially those
137 which require more deformation to fit the user be kept with the original individual. Users should be
138 taught how to visually inspect the respirators and how to do a seal check before re-use.

139 **Acknowledgements:**

140 We thank Tim Small, Alexis Dole, Calum Craig, and others who have donated FFP respirators for
141 testing, and especially to Tim who approached us to do this. We also give a big thanks to Craig Lewis,
142 and David Holmes, who did the face fit testing amidst their busy schedules. Thank you also to the
143 IOM laboratory team who provided the oven facilities, especially to David Todd who helped facilitate
144 this. Thanks to Karen Galea and Richard Gravelling for reviewing this work.

145

146 **References:**

147 CDC, 2020. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) [WWW Document]. Cent. Dis. Control Prev.
148 URL [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/decontamination-reuse-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/decontamination-reuse-respirators.html)
149 [respirators.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/decontamination-reuse-respirators.html) (accessed 4.11.20).

150 Cherrie, J.W., Apsley, A., Cowie, H., Steinle, S., Mueller, W., Lin, C., Horwell, C.J., Sleuwenhoek,
151 A., Loh, M., 2018. Effectiveness of face masks used to protect Beijing residents against
152 particulate air pollution. *Occup Env. Med* oemed-2017-104765.
153 <https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2017-104765>

154 Chin, A.W.H., Chu, J.T.S., Perera, M.R.A., Hui, K.P.Y., Yen, H.-L., Chan, M.C.W., Peiris, M., Poon,
155 L.L.M., 2020. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions. *Lancet*
156 *Microbe* 0. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247\(20\)30003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30003-3)

157 Decontamination Methods for 3M N95 Respirators [WWW Document], 2020. URL
158 [https://multimedia.3m.com/mws/media/18248690/decontamination-methods-for-3m-n95-](https://multimedia.3m.com/mws/media/18248690/decontamination-methods-for-3m-n95-respirators-technical-bulletin.pdf)
159 [respirators-technical-bulletin.pdf](https://multimedia.3m.com/mws/media/18248690/decontamination-methods-for-3m-n95-respirators-technical-bulletin.pdf) (accessed 4.21.20).

160 Fit2Fit Companion to HSE INDG479 [WWW Document], n.d. URL [https://www.fit2fit.org/wp-](https://www.fit2fit.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Guidance-document-Quantitative-APC.pdf)
161 [content/uploads/2019/04/Guidance-document-Quantitative-APC.pdf](https://www.fit2fit.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Guidance-document-Quantitative-APC.pdf)

162 Guidance on respiratory protective equipment (RPE) fit testing - INDG479 [WWW Document], 2019.
163 URL <https://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/indg479.htm> (accessed 4.13.20).

164 Heimbuch, B.K., Wallace, W.H., Kinney, K., Lumley, A.E., Wu, C.-Y., Woo, M.-H., Wander, J.D.,
165 2011. A pandemic influenza preparedness study: use of energetic methods to decontaminate
166 filtering facepiece respirators contaminated with H1N1 aerosols and droplets. *Am. J. Infect.*
167 *Control* 39, e1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2010.07.004>

168 Lindsley, W.G., Martin, S.B., Thewlis, R.E., Sarkisian, K., Nwoko, J.O., Mead, K.R., Noti, J.D.,
169 2015. Effects of Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation (UVGI) on N95 Respirator Filtration
170 Performance and Structural Integrity. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* 12, 509–517.
171 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15459624.2015.1018518>

172 Lore, M.B., Heimbuch, B.K., Brown, T.L., Wander, J.D., Hinrichs, S.H., 2012. Effectiveness of three
173 decontamination treatments against influenza virus applied to filtering facepiece respirators.
174 *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* 56, 92–101. <https://doi.org/10.1093/annhyg/mer054>

175 N95DECON - A scientific consortium for data-driven study of N95 FFR decontamination [WWW
176 Document], 2020. . N95DECON - Sci. Consort. Data-Driven Study N95 FFR Decontam.
177 URL <https://www.n95decon.org> (accessed 4.11.20).


178 Viscusi, D.J., Bergman, M.S., Eimer, B.C., Shaffer, R.E., 2009. Evaluation of Five Decontamination
179 Methods for Filtering Facepiece Respirators. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* 53, 815–827.
180 <https://doi.org/10.1093/annhyg/mep070>

181

182 Table 1: Masks tested, characteristics, oven temperature and time duration at that temperature

Brand	Model	Type	Shape	Valve	Fit type	Temperature (°C)	Time (mins)
Honeywell	5321 M/L	FFP3 NR	Cup	Yes	Gasket	NA	NA
3M	Aura 9332+Gen3	FFP3 NR	Flat trifold	Yes	Noseclip	65	56
3M	Aura 9320+	FFP2 NR	Flat trifold	No	Noseclip	65	56
3M	8833	FFP3 R D	Cup	Yes	Both	86	34
3M	1873V+	FFP3 NRD	Flat trifold	Yes	Noseclip	86	50
3M	1863+	FFP3 NRD	Flat trifold	No	Noseclip	86	50
							46*
3M	8835	FFP3	Cup	Yes	Gasket	65	56
3M	8810	FFP2	Cup	No	Noseclip	86	46
Alpha	S-3V	FFP3	Cup	Yes	Gasket	86	44
Solway							

183 *Same make and model of mask tested by two wearers



184

185 *Figure 1: Overall fit factor of masks tested pre- and post- heat treatment (3M1863 was tested by two people)*