

1 Selection of homemade mask materials for preventing 2 transmission of COVID-19: a laboratory study

3 Dijia Wang^{1&} Yanjun You^{2&} Xiaoli Zhou³ Zhiyong Zong⁴ Hao Huang³ Hui Zhang⁴ Xin Yong¹ Yifan
4 Cheng⁵ Liu Yang⁵ Qiong Guo⁵ Youlin Long⁵ Yan Liu⁶ Jin Huang^{7*} Liang Du^{8*}

5 1 Department of Equipment, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China

6 2 Sichuan Testing Center of Medical Devices, Chengdu, China

7 3 Department of Nursing, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China

8 4 Department of Infection Management, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China

9 5 Chinese Evidence-Based Medicine Center, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China

10 6 Emergency department of West China Hospital, Institute of Disaster Medicine, Department of Emergency and trauma nursing, West

11 China nursing school, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China

12 7 West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China

13 8 Center for Medical Device Supervision and Evaluation, Chinese Evidence-Based Medicine Center, West China Hospital, Sichuan

14 University, Chengdu, China

15

16 *michael_huangjin@163.com (JH); duliang0606@vip.sina.com (LD)

17 &These authors contributed equally to this work.

18

19 Abstract

20 The Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) has swept the whole world with high mortality.

21 Since droplet transmission is the main route of transmission, wearing a mask serves as a crucial

22 preventive measure. However, the virus has spread quite quickly, causing severe mask shortage.

23 Finding alternative materials for homemade masks while ensuring the significant performance
24 indicators will help alleviate the shortage of masks. Referring to the national standard for the
25 “Surgical Mask” of China, 17 materials to be selected for homemade masks were tested in four key
26 indicators: pressure difference, particle filtration efficiency, bacterial filtration efficiency and
27 resistance to surface wetting. Eleven single-layer materials met the standard of pressure difference
28 (≤ 49 Pa), of which 3 met the standard of resistance to surface wetting (≥ 3), 1 met the standard of
29 particle filtration efficiency ($\geq 30\%$), but none met the standard of bacterial filtration efficiency
30 ($\geq 95\%$). Based on the testing results of single-layer materials, fifteen combinations of paired
31 materials were tested. The results showed that three double-layer materials including double-layer
32 medical non-woven fabric, medical non-woven fabric plus non-woven shopping bag, and medical
33 non-woven fabric plus granular tea towel could meet all the standards of pressure difference,
34 particle filtration efficiency, and resistance to surface wetting, and were close to the standard of the
35 bacterial filtration efficiency. In conclusion, if resources are severely lacking and medical masks
36 cannot be obtained, homemade masks using available materials, based on the results of this study,
37 can minimize the chance of infection to the maximum extent.

38

39 **Introduction**

40 In December 2019, the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak occurred in the city
41 of Wuhan, Hubei province. Up to April 12, 2020, the outbreak has hit all provinces in China and
42 210 countries across the globe(1), which was declared as a Public Health Emergency of
43 International Concern (PHEIC) by the World Health Organization (WHO) (2). Droplet transmission
44 is the main routes of COVID-19 transmission. Most guidelines(3-5) recommend the use of masks to

45 prevent droplet transmission, hence wearing a mask is one of the most important preventive
46 measure. MacIntyre et al.(6) showed that adherence to masks significantly reduces the risk of
47 influenza infection (HR=0.26,95%CI 0.09-0.77). Brien et al.(7) showed that population-wide use
48 of face masks could make an important contribution in delaying an influenza pandemic. But during
49 the prediction period in China (from 20 Jan 2020 to 30 Jun 2020), the largest daily facemask
50 shortages were predicted to be 589.5, 49.3, and 37.5 million in each of the three scenarios,
51 respectively(8). Under the current global pandemic situation, the shortage of masks is still severe.
52 Fisher et al(9), Viscusi et al.(10) have explored methods to alleviate the shortage of masks through
53 reuse after disinfection and prolonged use time. However, with the increase of repeated uses and
54 prolonged use time, the protective effectiveness has significantly reduced(9). Van der Sande et
55 al.(11) have indicated that the protective factor of surgical masks was 4.1-5.3, while the protective
56 factor of homemade masks was 2.2-2.5, which could reduce the respiratory infections of the
57 population to a certain extent. Davies et al.(12) reported eight kinds of materials such as T-shirts,
58 vacuum cleaner bag, tea cloth and pillowcases, significantly reduced the number of microorganisms
59 expelled, although the surgical mask was three times more effective in blocking transmission than
60 the homemade mask. Therefore, homemade masks using civilian materials is of great value in
61 extreme cases of masks shortage.

62

63 The US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention advised residents to make cloth masks on
64 their own to slow the spread of the virus on April 9(13), and the National Health Commission for
65 Disease Control issued the “Notice on Printing and Distributing Technical Guidelines for the
66 Selection and Use of Masks for the Prevention of COVID-19 Infections in Different Populations”

67 on February 5, 2020, in which advises home residents, diaspora residents, outdoor activists, and
68 low-risk groups to voluntarily wear masks(14), but lacking guidance on how to select materials
69 scientifically. Inappropriate selection of masks may increase the chance of infection due to failing to
70 play a protective role. Therefore, the study aims to combine the comprehensive literature and expert
71 advice to screen the materials of homemade masks with good accessibility, then through laboratory
72 performance testing, materials suitable for homemade masks are selected to cope with the shortage
73 of medical masks and to protect against respiratory infectious diseases, so as to provide some
74 references for decision-makers.

75

76 **Materials and methods**

77 **Selection of homemade mask materials**

78 We searched the PubMed and EMBASE databases systematically and obtained 6 studies (11,
79 12, 15-18)on civilian homemade mask materials under the epidemic of H5N1 and SARS, including
80 T-shirts, scarves, tea towels, pillowcases, antibacterial pillowcases, vacuum cleaner dust bags, linen,
81 silk, etc(S1 Table). Then, an expert consensus meeting involved eight experts in related fields
82 including materials (2 people), nursing decontamination (2 people), evidence-based medicine and
83 clinical epidemiology (2 people), and hospital infection management (2 people) was held to
84 determined candidate materials for laboratorial testing. Finally, seventeen candidate materials were
85 selected for laboratory testing, including T-shirt, fleece sweater, outdoor jacket, down jacket,
86 sun-protective clothing, jeans, hairy tea towel, granular tea towel, non-woven fabrics shopping bag,
87 vacuum cleaner dust bag, diaper, sanitary pad, non-woven shopping bag, vacuum cleaner bag,
88 pillowcase A (40s × 40s air-jet down-proof fabric), pillowcase B (60s × 60s jet satin), pillowcase C

89 (80s × 60s jet satin), medical non-woven fabric, and medical medical gauze(S2 File). Furuhashi(19)
90 showed that the disposable mask made of glass fiber mat combined with non-woven fabric proved
91 to be high in performance with a B.F.E. of 98.1%-99.4%. As medical device packaging materials,
92 medical non-woven fabrics are widely applied in the field of medical device packaging owing to
93 their high antibacterial properties and strong air permeability(20). Because it is similar to the
94 material of medical masks, Chinese medical staff used it as a homemade mask material to improve
95 the shortage of masks. We combined with the expertise of experts in the relevant fields and years of
96 work experience, decided to include it in the study. Medical non-woven fabrics and medical medical
97 gauze were obtained from the Sterilization and Supply Center of West China Hospital, and the
98 remaining materials were purchased through malls and supermarkets(Table 1).

99

100 **Table 1. Selected candidate materials for homemade masks.**

| Material | Source | Brand | Fiber composition |
|-------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| T-shirt | Mall | Uniqlo | 100% cotton |
| Fleece sweater | Mall | Uniqlo | 100% cotton |
| Outdoor jacket | Mall | Decathlon | 100% polyurethane |
| Down jacket | Mall | Decathlon | 100% polyurethane |
| Sun-protective clothing | Mall | Decathlon | 100% polyester |
| Jeans | Mall | Uniqlo | 98% cotton/2% polyurethane |
| Hairy tea towel | Supermarket | Maryya | 80% polyester/20% nylon |
| Granular tea towel | Supermarket | Maryya | 80% polyester/20% nylon |
| Non-woven shopping bag | Mall | Eusu | 100% polypropylene |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|------------------|--|
| Vacuum cleaner bag | Electronic business platform(Jingdong) | Dmy | 100% polyethylene-vinyl acetate |
| Diaper | Supermarket | Elderjoy | Non-woven etc |
| Sanitary pad | Supermarket | Whisper | Non-woven etc |
| Pillowcase A | Hospital | Nantong Aokai | 40s×40s Air-jet down-proof fabric |
| Pillowcase B | Hospital | Nantong Aokai | 60s × 60s Jet satin |
| Pillowcase C | Hospital | Nantong Aokai | 80s×60s Jet satin |
| Medical non-woven fabric | Hospital | An Ruiheng | 2 Layers of spunbond + 3 layers of meltblown cloth |
| Medical gauze | Hospital | Rong Wei | Absorbent cotton |

101

102 **Detection Indicator**

103 According to the national standard YY0469-2011 "Surgical Mask" and
 104 GB/T4745-2012"Textiles-Testing and evaluation for water resistance-Spray test method"(21, 22),
 105 four key indicators to detect the performance of mask materials were performed, including pressure
 106 difference, particle filtration efficiency, bacterial filtration efficiency, and resistance to surface
 107 wetting. The definitions and standards of the detection indicators are shown in Table 2(21, 22).

108

109 **Table 2. Definitions and standards of detection indicators.**

| Detection indicator | Definition | Eligibility criteria |
|------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Pressure difference /Pa | The resistance of mask with the specified area and specified flow | ≤ 49 |
| Particle filtration efficiency /% | Under specified test conditions, the filter element filters out the percentage of particulate matter | ≥ 30 |
| Bacterial filtration efficiency /% | Percentage filtration of bacteria-containing suspended particles by mask material at a specified flow rate | ≥ 95 |
| Resistance to surface wetting | The resistance of fabrics to wetting or penetration by water, measured by the spray rating | ≥ 3 |

110

111 **Experimental Methods**

112 All materials were cut to 18*18 cm, and five samples from each material were tested by
113 Sichuan Testing Center of Medical Devices in China. The pressure difference, particle filtration
114 efficiency and bacterial filtration efficiency were determine by the test method stipulated in the
115 standard of YY0469-2011 "Surgical Masks", and resistance to surface wetting was tested in line
116 with the test method stipulated in the standard of GB/T4745-2012 "Textiles-Testing and evaluation
117 for water resistance-Spray test method". The Qingdao SRP ZR-1200 medical detection instrument
118 on surgical masks was used for pressure difference detection, with the gas flow rate at 8 L/min, the
119 diameter of the sample test zone 25 mm, and the test area 4.9 cm².

120 The American TSI 8130 automatic filter tester was employed for testing particle filtration
121 efficiency. The material was first placed in an environment with a relative humidity of 85% and at
122 38 °C for 24 hours for pretreatment and was then sealed in an airtight container. The test was

123 completed within 2 hours after the sample pretreatment. The test process entailed placing the
124 pretreated material in a NaCl aerosol with a relative humidity of 30% and at 25 °C (median
125 diameter of particle count $0.075 \pm 0.020 \mu\text{m}$), with a geometric standard deviation of the particle
126 distribution less than 1.86 and concentration no more than 200 mg/m^3 . The gas flow rate was set to
127 30 L/min, and the cross-sectional area through which the air flows was 100 cm^2 .

128 The bacterial filtration efficiency was tested in agreement with the standard of YY0469-2011
129 "Surgical Mask". The suspension of *Staphylococcus aureus* was prepared, followed by sterile plates
130 placed in the A and B chambers of the Qingdao SRP ZR-1000 experimental system, with six layers
131 in each chamber. Chamber A cavity was a positive control, and the pre-treated sample was installed
132 in the cavity B, with the gas flow rate at 28.3 L/min, the bacterial suspension delivery time of the
133 nebulizer 1 minute, and the operation time of sampler 2 minutes. After the test, the tryptic soy
134 peptone agar (TSA) medium plate was incubated at 35°C for 48 hours and removed subsequently.
135 The colony-forming units (positive pores) formed by bacterial particle aerosols were counted
136 afterward, and the number of possible impact particles was converted in accordance with the
137 conversion table(21), and 5 samples were tested using the same method.

138 The principle of resistance to surface wetting detection was to install the sample on the snap
139 ring and place it at a 45-degree angle to the horizontal, with the center of the sample 150 mm below
140 the nozzle, which was sprayed with 250 mL of distilled water. The spray rating was determined by
141 comparing the appearance of the sample with the evaluation standards and pictures, using Wenzhou
142 Darong Y(B) 813 fabric water-wetting tester as the test instrument.

143 The pressure difference of single-layer materials was firstly tested to exclude materials with a
144 pressure difference over 49 Pa, and the qualified materials of the pressure difference were further

145 tested for particle filtration efficiency, bacterial filtration efficiency and resistance to surface wetting.
146 Because all the single-layer materials had at least one indicator that failed to meet the eligibility
147 criteria, we, based on test results of the single-layer materials, further screened materials with
148 qualified resistance to surface wetting as the outer layer, with the same material or other materials
149 as the inner layer to form double-layer material, to test whether it can meet the standard. Due to the
150 limitation of testing equipment, materials with over two layers cannot be detected thanks to their
151 ultra-thickness, consequently, a combination of multi-layer materials was not further designed (Fig
152 1).

153

154 **Statistical methods**

155 Descriptive statistical analysis of the data was conducted with the use of SPSS18.0 software.
156 The mean, standard deviation, and 95% confidence interval (CI) of 5 samples of each
157 material/material combination in each indicator were reported in our study.

158

159 **Results**

160 **Test results of homemade mask materials for single-layer**

161 The laboratory testing results showed that 11 materials for single-layer homemade masks with a
162 pressure difference less than 49 Pa, and the order of pressure difference from small to large was as follows:
163 granular tea towel, fleece sweater, medical gauze (4 layers), medical gauze (8 layers), non-woven shopping
164 bag, medical gauze (12 layers), hairy tea towel, T-shirt, medical gauze (16 layers), pillowcase C, and medical
165 non-woven fabrics. The testing results showed that a total of 7 materials for the single-layer homemade mask
166 with a spray rating more than 3, and the order of spray rating from high to low was as follows: outdoor

167 jacket/medical non-woven fabric, down jacket/sun protective clothing, non-woven shopping bag, vacuum
 168 cleaner bag, and fleece sweater. Only three materials met both standards of pressure difference (≤ 49 Pa) and
 169 spray rating (≥ 3), including non-woven shopping bags, medical non-woven fabric, and fleece sweater (Table
 170 3).

171

172 **Table 3. Test results of pressure difference and spray rating for single-layer materials.**

| Material | Pressure Difference | | | Spray Rating | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----|
| | $\bar{X} \pm SD$ | 95% CI | Qualified or Not (≤ 49 Pa) | Qualified or Not (≥ 3) | |
| T-shirt | 15.80±1.01 | 14.54–17.06 | Yes | 0.0±0.0 | No |
| Fleece sweater | 5.86±0.42 | 5.34–6.38 | Yes | 3.4±0.5 | Yes |
| Outdoor jacket* | – | – | No | 4.4±0.5 | Yes |
| Down jacket | 125.36±0.77 | 124.40–126.32 | No | 4.2±0.4 | Yes |
| Sun-protective clothing | 125.26±1.12 | 123.87–126.65 | No | 4.2±0.4 | Yes |
| Jeans | 124.62±0.99 | 123.39–125.85 | No | 1.4±0.5 | No |
| Hairy tea towel | 13.72±0.53 | 13.06–14.38 | Yes | 1.2±0.4 | No |
| Granular tea towel | 5.72±0.13 | 5.56–5.88 | Yes | 1.4±0.5 | No |
| Non-woven shopping bag | 7.06±0.27 | 6.72–7.40 | Yes | 3.8±0.8 | Yes |
| Vacuum cleaner bag* | – | – | No | 3.8±0.4 | Yes |
| Diaper | 125.44±0.87 | 124.36–126.52 | No | 1.0±0.0 | No |
| Sanitary pad | 125.44±1.09 | 124.08–126.80 | No | 1.2±0.4 | No |
| Pillowcase A | 125.34±0.63 | 124.55–126.13 | No | 0.0±0.0 | No |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|-------------|-----|---------|-----|
| Pillowcase B | 67.80±0.88 | 66.71–68.89 | No | 1.8±0.4 | No |
| Pillowcase C | 26.86±0.58 | 26.14–27.58 | Yes | 1.2±0.4 | No |
| Medical non-woven fabric | 35.98±1.85 | 33.68–38.28 | Yes | 4.4±0.5 | Yes |
| Medical gauze (4 layers) [#] | 6.02±0.64 | 5.23–6.81 | Yes | – | No |
| Medical gauze (8layers) [#] | 6.36±0.42 | 5.84–6.88 | Yes | – | No |
| Medical gauze (12layers) [#] | 8.94±0.50 | 8.32–9.56 | Yes | – | No |
| Medical gauze (16layers) [#] | 17.52±1.33 | 15.87–19.17 | Yes | – | No |

173 * The pressure difference of outdoor jacket and vacuum cleaner bag cannot be tested caused by too high

174 ventilation resistance.

175 [#] The resistance to surface wetting of medical gauze is not considered, given its main function is to wrap wounds

176 and clean up bloodstains.

177

178 The particle filtration efficiency test was performed on the materials with qualified pressure difference,

179 and it was found that only the medical non-woven fabric out of the 11 materials had a particle filtration

180 efficiency of over 30% (mean=42%, SD=2%, 95% CI 40%-44%).

181

182 **Table 4. Test results of particle filtration efficiency of materials for single-layer homemade masks with**

183 **qualified pressure difference.**

| Material | $\bar{X} \pm SD$ | 95%CI | Qualified or Not pass($\geq 30\%$) |
|-----------------|------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|
| T-shirt | 12%±1% | 11%–14% | No |
| Fleece sweater | 6%±0% | 5%–6% | No |
| Hairy tea towel | 23%±1% | 22%–24% | No |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------|---------|-----|
| Granular tea towel | 12%±1% | 11%–13% | No |
| Non-woven shopping bag | 14%±2% | 12%–17% | No |
| Pillowcase C | 0%±0% | 0%–0% | No |
| Medical non-woven fabric | 42%±2% | 40%–44% | Yes |
| Medical gauze (4 layers) | 2%±0% | 2%–3% | No |
| Medical gauze (8layers) | 3%±0% | 3%–4% | No |
| Medical gauze (12layers) | 5%±0% | 5%–6% | No |
| Medical gauze (16layers) | 14%±1% | 12%–15% | No |

184

185 Further bacterial filtration efficiency testing results of medical non-woven fabric showed that it failed

186 to meet the standard of more than 95% (mean=62%, SD=1%, 95% CI 60%-64%) (Table 5).

187

188 **Table 5. Test results of bacterial filtration efficiency of materials for single-layer homemade masks with**

189 **qualified pressure difference and particle filtration efficiency.**

| Material | $\bar{X} \pm SD$ | 95%CI | Qualified or Not ($\geq 95\%$) |
|--------------------------|------------------|---------|----------------------------------|
| Medical non-woven fabric | 62%±1% | 60%–64% | No |

190

191 **Test results of homemade mask materials for double-layer**

192 Fifteen double-layer materials were tested. The results demonstrated that there were 12 (80%)

193 double-layer materials with a pressure difference of ≤ 49 Pa, with double-layer fleece sweater as the

194 minimum pressure difference (mean=12.40, SD=1.53, 95%CI 10.50-14.30), and medical non-woven fabric

195 plus granular tea towel as the maximum pressure difference (mean=43.52, SD=1.48, 95%CI

196 41.68-45.36)(Table 6).

197

198 **Table 6. Test results of pressure difference of materials for double-layer homemade masks.**

| Material | $\bar{X} \pm SD$ | 95%CI | Qualified or Not (≤ 49 Pa) |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| Fleece sweater +T-shirt | 20.32±0.55 | 19.63–21.01 | Yes |
| Fleece sweater+ Hairy tea towel | 22.84±0.92 | 21.70–23.98 | Yes |
| Fleece sweater + Granular tea towel | 14.08±0.83 | 13.05–15.11 | Yes |
| Fleece sweater + Fleece sweater | 12.40±1.53 | 10.50–14.30 | Yes |
| Non-woven shopping bag + T-shirt | 25.26±1.30 | 23.64–26.88 | Yes |
| Non-woven shopping bag + Hairy tea towel | 23.64±1.35 | 21.97–25.31 | Yes |
| Non-woven shopping bag + Granular tea towel | 14.44±0.62 | 13.67–15.21 | Yes |
| Non-woven shopping bag + Fleece sweater | 14.40±0.77 | 13.44–15.36 | Yes |
| Non-woven shopping bag + Non-woven shopping bag | 13.72±0.70 | 12.85–14.59 | Yes |
| Medical non-woven fabric + T-shirt | 51.06±1.13 | 49.66–52.46 | No |
| Medical non-woven fabric + Fleece sweater | 50.08±1.84 | 47.80–52.36 | No |
| Medical non-woven fabric + Hairy tea towel | 51.00±1.31 | 49.37–52.63 | No |
| Medical non-woven fabric + Granular tea towel | 43.52±1.48 | 41.68–45.36 | Yes |
| Medical non-woven fabric + Non-woven shopping bag | 40.64±1.55 | 38.71–42.57 | Yes |
| Medical non-woven fabric + Medical non-woven fabric | 25.66±1.40 | 23.92–27.40 | Yes |

199

200 Of the 12 double-layer materials which met the standard of pressure difference, seven (58.3%)

201 double-layer material had a particle filtration efficiency of more than 30%. The particle filtration efficiency
 202 of the fleece sweater plus hairy tea towel was more than 50%, nearly equal to that of double-layer medical
 203 non-woven fabric (Table 7).

204

205 **Table 7. Test results of particle filtration efficiency of materials for double-layer homemade masks with**
 206 **qualified pressure difference.**

| Material | $\bar{X} \pm SD$ | 95%CI | Qualified or Not ($\geq 30\%$) |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Fleece sweater + T-shirt | 12%±1% | 11%-13% | No |
| Fleece sweater + Hairy tea towel | 56%±1% | 54%-57% | Yes |
| Fleece sweater + Granular tea towel | 11%±1% | 10%-12% | No |
| Fleece sweater + Fleece sweater | 11%±0% | 10%-11% | No |
| Non-woven shopping bag + T-shirt | 30%±1% | 29%-31% | No |
| Non-woven shopping bag + Hairy tea towel | 47%±1% | 46%-48% | Yes |
| Non-woven shopping bag + Granular tea towel | 47%±1% | 46%-48% | Yes |
| Non-woven shopping bag + Fleece sweater | 35%±2% | 33%-37% | Yes |
| Non-woven shopping bag + Non-woven shopping bag | 19%±1% | 17%-21% | No |
| Medical non-woven fabric + Granular tea towel | 48%±1% | 48%-49% | Yes |
| Medical non-woven fabric + Non-woven shopping bag | 40%±1% | 40%-41% | Yes |
| Medical non-woven fabric + Medical non-woven fabric | 54%±1% | 53%-55% | Yes |

207

208 Concerning the bacterial filtration efficiency, none of the double-layer materials met the standard

209 (>95%), but three double-layer materials were close to the standard, including double-layer medical
 210 non-woven fabric (mean=93%, SD=1, 95% CI 91%-95%), medical non-woven fabric plus non-woven
 211 shopping bag (mean=89%, SD=2%, 95% CI 86%-92%), and medical non-woven fabric plus granular tea
 212 towel (mean=88%, SD=4%, 95% CI 84%-92%)(Table 8).

213

214 **Table 8. Test results of bacterial filtration efficiency of materials for double-layer homemade masks with**
 215 **qualified pressure difference and particle filtration efficiency.**

| Material | $\bar{X} \pm SD$ | 95%CI | Qualified or Not ($\geq 95\%$) |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Fleece sweater+ Hairy tea towel | 24% \pm 3% | 21%-27% | No |
| Non-woven shopping bag + Hairy tea towel | 23% \pm 2% | 20%-25% | No |
| Non-woven shopping bag + Granular tea towel | 17% \pm 3% | 12%-21% | No |
| Non-woven shopping bag + Fleece sweater | 16% \pm 1% | 15%-18% | No |
| Medical non-woven fabric + Granular tea towel | 88% \pm 4% | 84%-92% | No |
| Medical non-woven fabric + Non-woven shopping bag | 89% \pm 2% | 86%-92% | No |
| Medical non-woven fabric + Medical non-woven fabric | 93% \pm 1% | 91%-95% | No |

216

217 **Discussion**

218 Our study found that the bacterial filtration efficiency of homemade masks failed to meet the
 219 standards of surgical masks, but pressure difference and particle filtration efficiency of most
 220 materials/material combinations met the standards. For example, the pressure difference and
 221 particle filtration efficiency for medical non-woven fabric, both double-layer and single-layer,

222 reached the standard, and the bacterial filtration efficiency of the double-layer medical non-woven
223 fabric was close to the standard of surgical masks.

224 The medical non-woven fabric in our study is an SMMMS non-woven fabric composed of 2
225 layers of spunbond and 3 layers of meltblown fabrics. The structure of surgical masks is usually in
226 three-layer: the outer layer is a spunbond nonwoven fabric with a water-blocking effect to prevent
227 droplets from entering the mask; the middle layer is a meltblown nonwoven fabric with a filtering
228 effect; the inner layer is a spunbond nonwoven fabric with the function of absorbing moisture(23).
229 Among them, meltblown non-woven fabric serves as the most important component(24). The
230 differences in the process whether electret treatment is performed, weight, and thickness between
231 the two may be the reason why the medical non-woven fabrics are close but fail to meet the
232 standards of surgical masks. The special porous arrangement of medical non-woven fabric enables
233 the steam and other media to penetrate the bag flexibly, which has a significant bacteriostasis effect,
234 and has the characteristics of good breathability, small penetration rate, strong water resistance, and
235 flame retardancy(25). Li Muping et al.(26) found that the double-layer medical non-woven fabric
236 could effectively block bacteria within 3 months. Zou Xiuzhen et al.(27)discovered that the
237 disposable non-woven fabric material had good antibacterial effectiveness, and was consistent with
238 the results of our study. At present, medical non-woven fabrics are usually supplied directly to
239 hospitals by manufacturers or suppliers. Residents can also purchase them through some
240 e-commerce platforms such as Amazon and Taobao, but their quality assurance has yet to be
241 verified.

242 Although three fabric materials (T-shirt, fleece sweater, and tea towel) tested in our study could
243 not reach the standard of surgical mask in terms of bacterial filtration efficiency, some combinations

244 of the three materials showed a higher level of particle filtration, such as fleece sweater plus hairy
245 tea towel. Studies demonstrated that the filtering performance of fabric materials was similar to
246 surgical masks in some aspects. For example, the permeability of fabric materials such as T-shirts
247 and tea towels under the polydisperse NaCl aerosols was 40% to 90%, while that of a surgical mask
248 was 51% to 89%(15, 16). Davies et al. (12)reported that tea towels demonstrated high filtration
249 efficiency in both Bacillus atrophaeus and MS2 bacteriophage aerosols, and the filtration efficiency
250 of double-layer tea towels was close to that of medical surgical mask. Van der Sande et al.(11)
251 found that the homemade tea towel mask could still play a protective role to a certain degree and
252 would not be affected by supply restrictions, although its protective effect was not as strong as a
253 surgical mask or FFP2 mask. However, the materials of homemade masks are not fully recognized
254 in available literatures,and their performance indexes were not tested and verified systematically. It
255 is not clear whether the protective effects of homemade mask materials meet the relevant national
256 standards. Based on previous studies and expert opinions, our study included as many homemade
257 mask materials with good accessibility as possible, and tested relevant indicators in strict
258 accordance with national standards. We also explicitly reported whether these materials met the
259 standards, which can provide a more scientific reference for the selection of materials for
260 homemade masks.

261 The study design was to use a layer of material with qualified resistance to surface wetting as
262 the outer layer, a layer of material with qualified particle filtration and bacterial filtration efficiency
263 as the intermediate layer, and a layer of material with better hygroscopicity and skin affinity as the
264 inner layer. Comfort was an important factor that affected the compliance of wearing a mask(28,
265 29). Results have indicated that materials such as medical gauze and T-shirt, which had fewer

266 internal yarn threads, less ventilation resistance, and better skin-friendliness, could be used as inner
267 layer materials. Materials such as non-woven shopping bags and fleece sweater materials, which
268 contained tight surface structure, arranged surface texture in parallel, and better surface wettability,
269 could be used as the outer layer material(30). The filtration performance of the most critical
270 intermediate layer material mainly depended on its fiber characteristics, including diameter, charge
271 and fabric density(12). Only medical non-woven fabrics were close to the standard of medical
272 surgical masks in line with results.

273 Limitations concerning this study are as follows: the study did not test the flame retardant
274 properties, skin irritation, and delayed-type hypersensitivity of the materials. Samples tested in the
275 study were only the original materials rather than the masks made of these materials. Most of the
276 tested materials were purchased from local supermarkets, thus testing results of these materials
277 could be greatly affected by their types, batches, and manufacturers. The performance of the mask
278 on wearing time, wearing frequency, and environment were not tested because no molded masks
279 were made. All of the data were based on laboratory testing while its actual effectiveness in the
280 protection of the crowd, wearing comfort, adverse reactions still need to be verified by human trials
281 and real-world studies.

282

283 **Conclusions**

284 In summary, the study shows that some materials and their combinations for homemade masks
285 could meet several standards of surgical masks. If resources are severely lacking and medical masks
286 cannot be obtained, homemade masks using available materials, based on the results of this study,
287 can minimize the chance of infection to the maximum extent.

288

289 **Acknowledgments**

290 We thank scientific and technological project supported by West China Hospital of Sichuan
291 University for tackling COVID-19, and also thank technology innovation project supported by
292 Chengdu Science and Technology Bureau for tackling COVID-19.

293

294 **References**

- 295 1. Coronavirus Outbreak. Available at: <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/>
- 296 2. WHO. Statement on the Second Meeting of the International Health Regulations(2005)Emergency Committee
297 Regarding the Outbreak of Novel Coronavirus(2019-nCoV); 2020.
- 298 3. National plan for the prevention and control of influenza pandemic. Paris:Genral Secretariat for National Defence;
299 2007.
- 300 4. Australian health management plan for pandemic influenza: important information for all Australians.
301 Canberra:Department of Health and Ageing,Commonwealth of Australia; 2006.
- 302 5. Department of Health and Human Services. HHS pandemic influenza plan. Washington:The Department; 2005.
- 303 6. MacIntyre CR, Cauchemez S, Dwyer DE, Seale H, Cheung P, Browne G, et al. Face Mask Use and Co-ntrol of
304 Respiratory Virus Transmission in Households. EMERG INFECT DIS.
305 2009;15(2):233-41.<http://doi.org/10.3201/eid1502.081167> PMID:19193267
- 306 7. Brienens NCJ, Timen A, Wallinga J, Van Steenbergen JE, Teunis PFM. The Effect of Mask Use on the Spread of
307 Influenza During a Pandemic.RISK ANAL.2010;30(8):1210-8.<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01428.x>
308 PMID:20497389
- 309 8. Wu H, Huang J, Zhang CJP, He Z, Ming W. Facemask shortage and the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19)

- 310 outbreak: Reflections on public health measures. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020:100329.
- 311 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100329> PMID:32292898
- 312 9. Fisher EM, Shaffer RE. Considerations for Recommending Extended Use and Limited Reuse of Filtering
313 Facepiece Respirators in Health Care Settings. *J OCCUP ENVIRON HYG*.2014;11(8):D115-28.
314 <http://doi.org/10.1080/15459624.2014.902954> PMID: 24628658
- 315 10. Viscusi DJ, Bergman MS, Eimer BC, Shaffer RE. Evaluation of five decontamination methods for filtering
316 facepiece respirators. *ANN OCCUP HYG*. 2009;53(8):815-27. <http://doi.org/10.1093/annhyg/mep070> PMID:
317 19805391
- 318 11. Van der Sande M, Teunis P, Sabel R. Professional and home-made face masks reduce exposure to respiratory
319 infections among the general population. *PLOS ONE*. 2008;3(7):e2618. <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0002618>
320 PMID: 18612429
- 321 12. Davies A, Thompson K, Giri K, Kafatos G, Walker J, Bennett A. Testing the Efficacy of Homemade Masks:
322 Would They Protect in an Influenza Pandemic? *DISASTER MED PUBLIC*. 2013;7(4):413-8.
323 <http://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2013.43> PMID: 24229526
- 324 13. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Use of Cloth Face Coverings to Help Slow the Spread of COVID-19;
325 2020.
- 326 14. National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China. Notice on Printing and Distributing Technical
327 Guidelines for the Selection and Use of Masks for the Prevention of COVID-19 Infections in Different Populations;
328 2020.
- 329 15. Rengasamy S, Eimer B, Shaffer RE. Simple Respiratory Protection—Evaluation of the Filtration Performance of
330 Cloth Masks and Common Fabric Materials Against 20–1000 nm Size Particles. *The Annals of Occupational Hygiene*.
331 2010;54(7):789-798. <http://doi.org/10.1093/annhyg/meq044> PMID: 20584862

- 332 16. Dato VM, Hostler D, Hahn ME. Simple respiratory mask. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*.2006;6(12):1033-1034.
- 333 <http://doi.org/10.3201/eid1206.051468> PMID: 16752475
- 334 17. Cooper DW, Hinds WC, Price JM, Weker R, Yee HS. Common Materials for Emergency Respiratory Protection:
- 335 Leakage Tests with a Manikin. *American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal*. 1983;10(44):720-726.
- 336 <http://doi.org/10.1080/1528668391405634> PMID: 6650392
- 337 18. Guyton HG, Decker HM, Anton GT. Emergency respiratory protection against radiological and biological aerosols.
- 338 *AMA Arch Ind Health*. 1959;2(20):91-95. PMID: 13669760
- 339 19. Furuhashi M. A study on the microbial filtration efficiency of surgical face masks-with special reference to the
- 340 non-woven fabric mask. *Bull Tokyo Med Dent Univ*. 1978;1(25):7-15. PMID: 343940
- 341 20. Wenting W, Yiling S, Hao L. Selection of Sterilization Methods for Domestic Medical Packaging Materials and
- 342 Analysis of Bacteriostatic Effect. *China Packaging*. 2016;36(08):30-7.
- 343 21. State Food and Drug Administration. Surgical mask. YY 0469-2011. Beijing: China Standard Press; 2011.
- 344 22. China National Textile and Apparel Council. Textiles-Testing and evaluation for water resistance-Spray test
- 345 method. GB/T 4745-2012. Beijing: China Standard Press; 2012.
- 346 23. Fengxiang C, Lisha Z, Keshuai L, Zhenwei Y, Weilin X. Research progress and its developing trend
- 347 of protective masks. *Journal of Xi'an Polytechnic University*. 2020;34(2):1-12.
- 348 24. Oberg T, Brosseau LM. Surgical mask filter and fit performance. *AM J INFECT CONTROL*. 2008;36(4):276-282.
- 349 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2007.07.008> PMID: 18455048
- 350 25. Shimasaki N, Okaue A, Kikuno R, Shinohara K. Comparison of the Filter Efficiency of Medical Nonwoven
- 351 Fabrics against Three Different Microbe Aerosols. *BIOCONTROL SCI*. 2018;23(2):61-69.
- 352 <http://doi.org/10.4265/bio.23.61> PMID: 29910210
- 353 26. Muping L, Lichan Z. Inclosed and Bacteriostatic Effect of Compound Packaging Material on Internal Cotton and

- 354 External Non-woven in Sterilization of Surgical Instruments. Medical Innovation of China. 2018;10(15):133-136.
- 355 27. Xiuzhen Z, Shujie X, Jianmei X, Haiyan W, Lu N. Sterilization effect and cost of non-woven fabrics and cotton
356 used for wrapping package. Chinese Journal of Infection Control. 2012;5(11):133-136.
- 357 28. Chughtai AA, Seale H, Dung TC, Hayen A, Rahman B, Raina MacIntyre C. Compliance with the Use of Medical
358 and Cloth Masks Among Healthcare Workers in Vietnam. ANN OCCUP HYG. 2016;60(5):619-30.
359 <http://doi.org/10.1093/annhyg/mew008> PMID: 26980847
- 360 29. Shakya KM, Noyes A, Kallin R, Peltier RE. Evaluating the efficacy of cloth facemasks in reducing particulate
361 matter exposure. J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol. 2017;27(3):352-357. <http://doi.org/10.1038/jes.2016.42> PMID:
362 27531371
- 363 30. Qiangqiang F. Research and Development of Ate-model and Comfortable Mateials for Medical Mask: Xi'an
364 Polytechnic University; 2012.

365

366 **Supporting information**

367 **S1 Table. Previous research on homemade mask materials**

368 **S2 File. Pictures of candidate homemade mask materials**

369

