

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<sup>1,\*</sup>, Evan L. Floyd<sup>1</sup>, Kathleen A. Aithinne<sup>1</sup>, Toluwanimi Oni<sup>1</sup>**

5 <sup>1</sup>Department 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**

13 The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health procedure No. TEB-  
14 APR-STP-0059 recommend of measuring the respirator filtration efficiency using  
15 sodium chloride aerosol with count median diameter of 75 nm ± 20 nm and geometric  
16 standard deviation ≤1.86. This study showed that this method would overestimate the  
17 respirators' ability to protect against submicrometer particles. In this study, we  
18 converted both mobility diameter and equivalent volume diameter to aerodynamic  
19 diameter for comparison. The results showed that one unqualified KN95 respirator  
20 (with the filtration efficiency of 72%±3% for ≥300 nm sodium chloride aerosol) still  
21 passed the test with a measured overall filtration efficiency of 98%±3%, due to its larger  
22 most penetrating particle size compared to the typical N95 respirator. In addition, after  
23 three cycle H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> plasma vaporous sterilizations, the most penetrating particle size for  
24 the N95 grade respirators also shifted to 250 nm – 500 nm, in which size the particles  
25 carried the peak concentration of the SARS-CoV-2 in hospitals. This size shift caused

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<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> 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%±2%, but, the measured overall filtration efficiency was still 90%±3%. 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<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>.

36

37 **Keywords:** N95, KN95, Size Specific Filtration Efficiency, Overall Filtration  
38 Efficiency, Submicrometer Particles, SARS-CoV-2

39

## 40 **1. Introduction**

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 (1,2). 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  $\geq 300$  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  $75 \text{ nm} \pm 20 \text{ nm}$  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 nm – 500  
55 nm (aerodynamic diameter) particles (6), although the actual SARS-CoV-2 size ranges only  
56 from 60 nm – 150 nm (7,8,9). 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  $75 \text{ nm} \pm 20 \text{ nm}$  and GSD of  $\leq 1.86$ . However, using this size NaCl  
59 test aerosol means that around 89.9% particles are  $\leq 250$  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 (*I1*); 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  $\leq 250$  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**

### 73 **2.1 Experimental Setup**

74 We tested KN95 respirators from over 20 various manufacturers, and selected two of  
75 them (one qualified and one unqualified) for analysis in this study. We analyzed the reasons  
76 why the unqualified KN95 respirator (Nine Particles Medical Equipment Co, Ltd, Yongzhou,  
77 Hunan, China) still passed the test using the NIOSH recommended NaCl test aerosol. We  
78 also compared the effects of two- and three-cycle sterilization using vaporous plasma  
79 hydrogen peroxide (H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>) and ultraviolet (UV) germicidal irradiation on the filtration  
80 efficiencies by size of KN95 (qualified one from Civilian Antivirus, Qingdao, Shandong,  
81 China) and N95 (model 1860, 3M, St Paul, MN, USA) respirator. The experimental setup  
82 was illustrated in previous study (*I2*). A NaCl aerosol was generated using a Collision

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  
 85 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  
 87 16.8 nm to 514 nm up and down stream of each sample. We conducted a two-sample t-test  
 88 (with  $\alpha=0.05$  as significance threshold) to compare the mean filtration efficiency of the five  
 89 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):

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

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

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


98 where  $d_a$  is aerodynamic diameter;  $\rho_p$  and  $\rho_0$  are particle density and standard density (1g cm<sup>-3</sup>)  
 99 <sup>3</sup>), respective;  $Cc(d_a)$  is the slip correction factors for  $d_a$ ;  $\chi$  is the dynamic shape factor. The  
 100 salt aerosol density is 1.75 – 1.99 g cm<sup>-3</sup>, 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<sup>-3</sup> 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  
106 showed that the respirator passed the filtration efficiency test with an overall filtration  
107 efficiency of  $98\pm 3\%$ , 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  
109 as a N95 grade respirator since the filtration efficiency for particles  $\geq 300 \text{ nm}$  is  $72\pm 3\%$ ,  
110 which is much lower than a minimum of 95% (**Figure 1b**).

111




112

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

115

116 We conducted a sensitivity study of estimating the overall filtration efficiency by  
117 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  
119 overall filtration efficiency would gradually decrease from 97% to 82% by increasing the test  
120 aerosol CMAD from 79 nm to 278 nm.



121

122 **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<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> sterilization cycles, the filtration efficiency for  
127 250 nm – 500 nm particles dropped from 84%±2% to 69%±2% for KN95, and from 97%±2%  
128 to 55%±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%±0.6% after three cycles; and the filtration efficiency of N95 was  
132 95.9%±1.4% after two cycles, and 96.9%±0.7% after three cycles. The differences were not  
133 statistically significant between two and three cycles for both KN95 ( $p$ -value = 0.852±0.093)

134 and N95 ( $p\text{-value} = 0.448 \pm 0.267$ ).

135

(a) KN95 – Civilian Antivirus Mask

(b) N95 - 3M 1860 Mask



136

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

138  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  and UV treatment for (a) N95, and (b) KN9.

139

140 **Table 1.** Comparison of overall filtration efficiency and size specific (250 nm – 500 nm)




141 filtration efficiency after multi-cycle H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> treatment.

Respirator Type	H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> Treatment	Overall Filtration Efficiency	Size Specific 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%

142

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



152

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

154

155 **4. Discussion**

156 This study proposed that the current NaCl test aerosol size might need to be increased  
 157 for testing the new KN95 respirator, and the reuse of N95 level respirators after sterilizations  
 158 due to their much larger MPPS compared to traditional N95 respirators'. In addition to  
 159 considering the overall filtration efficiency, the filtration efficiencies for particle sizes similar  
 160 to infectious particles should be considered. This study also found that the two different  
 161 multi-cycle sterilization processes have unique effects on the filtration efficiencies by aerosol  
 162 size of different respirators. Multi-cycle sterilization with UV appears to have fewer negative  
 163 effects than H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. Limitations include the small variety of respirator manufacturers and the  
 164 limited numbers of samples (n=5) for each respirator and only two sterilization techniques  
 165 evaluated. In addition, this study only evaluated the filtration efficiency after three  
 166 sterilization cycles as this corresponds with guidance from the American College of Surgeons  
 167 for H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> sterilization. The filter material might degrade further with more cycles, which

168 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.

176

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-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2271-3)  
195 [020-2271-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2271-3)
- 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.

219 15. Kuwata, M., & Kondo, Y. (2011). Measurements of particle masses of inorganic salt  
220 particles for calibration of cloud condensation nuclei counters. *Inorganic Chemistry:*  
221 *Reactions, Structure and Mechanisms*. 2011; 239.  
222  
223

224 **Figure/Table Legends**

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

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

228 **Figure 3.** Effects of multi-cycle sterilization on filtration efficiency by aerosol size using  
229 H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and UV treatment for (a) N95, and (b) KN9.

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

231 **Table 1.** Comparison of overall filtration efficiency and size specific (250 nm – 500 nm)  
232 filtration efficiency after multi-cycle H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> treatment.