

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**

5 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**

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 H₂O₂ 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25 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**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 H₂O₂ 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 H₂O₂.

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 ≥ 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) ≤ 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 ≤ 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 ≤ 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**

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_2O_2) 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 (*12*). 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} ; χ_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; ρ_p and ρ_0 are particle density and standard density (1 g cm^{-3})
99 respectively; $Cc(d_a)$ is the slip correction factors for d_a ; χ is the dynamic shape factor. The
100 salt aerosol density is $1.75 - 1.99 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, 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
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 H₂O₂ 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 -value = 0.448 ± 0.267).

135




141 filtration efficiency after multi-cycle H₂O₂ treatment.

Respirator Type	H ₂ O ₂ 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 H₂O₂ treatment (see **Table 1**). For instance, the overall
145 filtration efficiencies for KN95 and N95 after three cycle H₂O₂ 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 H₂O₂ 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 H₂O₂. 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 H₂O₂ 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 H₂O₂ 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 H₂O₂ treatment.