

1 **Aerosol filtering efficiency of respiratory face masks used**
2 **during the COVID-19 pandemic.**

3
4 **Glykeria Loupa^{*}, Dimitra Karali, Spyridon Rapsomanikis**

5
6 *Laboratory of Atmospheric Pollution and Pollution Control Engineering of Atmospheric*
7 *Pollutants, Department of Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Democritus*
8 *University of Thrace, P.O. Box 447, 67100 Xanthi, Greece.*

9
10 **Abstract**

11
12 The spread of the COVID-19 pandemic, effected the imposition of personal protection
13 measures in a large number of countries. The use of commercially available personal face masks
14 was widely accepted as such a protective measure. Since the quality of the face masks scanned
15 the spectrum from surgical to the home made fabric ones, it was considered appropriate to
16 experimentally establish their effectiveness for stopping aerosol in entering the respiratory system
17 of the bearer. Presently, only eight masks were tested with polydisperse indoor air. Their
18 effectiveness was examined for aerosol of aerodynamic diameters of 0.006 μm to 10 μm . Of these
19 masks, only two were effective for the whole range of aerosol. Cloth masks were found to be
20 ineffective for the assigned task.

21
22 **Keywords:** Face masks; Aerosol dynamics; Particle filtration; Protective equipment; Indoor air.

23
24

* Corresponding author. Tel: Tel: +30-2541-0-79314; Fax: +30-2541-0-79379

E-mail address: gloupa@env.duth.gr

25 INTRODUCTION

26

27 The recent pandemic of COVID-19, has been the concern of the scientific community of most
28 disciplines. The pandemic introduced the widespread application of policies for constraining its
29 spread (Fineberg, 2020; National Academies of Sciences and Medicine, 2020; World Health
30 Organization, WHO, 2020). Apart from lockdowns of cities, public services and whole countries,
31 individual measures suggested and enacted by state decrees, included the use of personal
32 respiratory face masks (MacIntyre *et al.*, 2015; Centers for Disease Control Prevention, CDC,
33 2020).

34 The new virus SARS-CoV-2, as all the viruses in the atmosphere are particles floating in the
35 air (aerosol). Aerosol (or airborne particulate matter, PM) is defined by the International Union of
36 Pure and Applied Chemistry, IUPAC as: “*Mixtures of small particles (solid, liquid, or a mixed
37 variety) and the carrier gas (usually air); owing to their size, these particles (usually less than
38 100 μm and greater than 0.01 μm in diameter) have a comparatively small settling velocity and
39 hence exhibit some degree of stability in the earth's gravitational field*” (Calvert, 1990). Viruses
40 are a category of aerosol of biological origin and referred to as bioaerosol (Douwes *et al.*, 2008;
41 Yao, 2018). Viruses, such as SARS, H1N1 and MERS-CoV, pose distinct health risks, in addition
42 to the known aerosol health effects (Yao, 2018). Their transmission from person to person
43 through the atmosphere is a pathway of infection that is not well explored, although a very

44 important one, especially for the indoor environments (Nazaroff, 2016; Yao, 2018; Anderson *et*
45 *al.*, 2020; Fears *et al.*, 2020).

46 Bioaerosol has similar dynamics with all the airborne particles and the prevailing parameter
47 that characterises its fate in the atmosphere is its size. How far these particles can be transmitted
48 (emitted from coughing, or sneezing or even from talking from infected persons) and for how
49 long they remain suspended, depends on their size (Lee *et al.*, 2019). The gravitation settling is
50 more significant for the larger particles, prohibiting them to be transmitted to long distances.
51 However, exhaled droplets become dry particles in the air, hence their size is reduced (fast)
52 (Morawska *et al.*, 2009; Hinds, 2011). For the smaller particles, turbulence is the dominant
53 dispersion mechanism, enabling them to travel long distances from their source and for a long
54 time.

55 Hence, the health effects and the possible protective measures against aerosol containing
56 viruses, depend on several critical parameters, such as the particle size, the aerosol atmospheric
57 number concentration in different sizes, the aerosol atmospheric lifetime and the atmospheric
58 lifetime of the virus associate with it (Guzman, 2020; Mutuku *et al.*, 2020). Such parameters will
59 determine how far viruses can be transmitted depending on the range of the sizes of the airborne
60 particles carrying the viruses, how deep in the respiratory system can penetrate if inhaled and in
61 the end their infectivity (Kunkel *et al.*, 2017).

62 Morawska *et al.*, (2009) reported that the majority of particles emitted during all expiratory
63 activities of humans have diameters below 0.8 μm , and their size distribution had one or more
64 modes. A recent publication for two Wuhan hospitals (Liu *et al.*, 2020), indicates that the most
65 abundant, in number, viral particles have aerodynamic diameter between 250 nm and 500 nm.

66 Face masks have been used for years to protect the public from aerosol or bioaerosol and the
67 filtration efficiency of individual masks has been examined in several studies (for example
68 (Rengasamy *et al.*, 2010; Mueller *et al.*, 2018). This efficiency depends on the material of the
69 mask, its design (e.g. with exhaust valve or not), the face velocity of the aerosol that impacts on
70 the mask and the fitting of the mask to the person's face (Rengasamy *et al.*, 2010; Steinle *et al.*,
71 2018; Dbouk and Drikakis, 2020; Konda *et al.*, 2020). Finally, the aerosol filtering efficiency of a
72 face mask protecting from viruses, has to be examined in relation to the spectrum of the sizes of
73 particles carrying viruses (internally or externally mixed) that travel in the air and reach our
74 respiratory system (Drossinos and Stilianakis, 2020; Konda *et al.*, 2020).

75 Due to high demand for masks worn by the public and the shortage in their supply during the
76 COVID-19 pandemic masks of unknown efficiency and quality appeared in the market.

77 In the present work, the filtration efficiency of eight commercially available face masks was
78 examined under near realistic conditions as a function of the different sizes of aerosol found in an
79 indoor environment which ranged between 6 nm and 10 μm . Some theoretical considerations on

80 the airborne transmission of the exhaled respiratory droplets and the examination of the filtration
81 efficiency of the 8 masks in relation with aerosol size distribution is also determined.

82

83 **METHODS**

84

85 Eight (8) respiratory face masks for use by the general public were tested for their aerosol
86 filtering efficiency in an indoor environment of the campus of the Democritus University of
87 Thrace, Xanthi, Greece, during May 2020. These masks were commercially available worldwide
88 and at a price that most can pay, i.e. between 0.8 and 5 Euro. In Greece, they are sold in
89 pharmacies, but one can also purchase them from the internet. Five of them are 3-layer masks
90 (referred to as M1, M2, M3, M4, M5), one is a KN95 mask with “one way valve” (named as M6).
91 Two masks referred to as F1 and F2, are fabric masks. The characteristics of the tested masks are
92 presented in Table1, as they are provided on the label of their packaging. Note that only half of
93 them have a brand name and their photos are depicted in the graphical abstract of the present
94 work.

95 The experiments were conducted inside an indoor environment which was naturally ventilated
96 with an air exchange rate of 0.8-1.1 h⁻¹ for a volume of 150 m³. The instrumentation used
97 comprised of two supplementary, in series, set ups. A light scattering particle counter, PROMO
98 2000 and an SMPS –CPC particle counter were used (Palas®, Karlsruhe, Germany). For details
99 see the Supplementary Material.

100 Each mask was fitted directly on the inlets of the instruments (see Fig. 1). Data were collected
101 for 30 min with the inlets open in the air of the room (background) and for the next 30 min with
102 the inlets covered with a mask. For each of the eight tested type of mask, six replicates were
103 conducted. Occasionally, the inlet was moved to a different area of the mask, to ensure
104 homogeneous coverage of the penetration area. The instrumental rate of sampling air at 0.5 l min^{-1}
105 for the SMPS-CPC and an inlet tubing 3/8" or ca 6 mm diameter, resulted in a face velocity of
106 the entering aerosol ($\text{PM}_{2.5}$) of 0.3 m s^{-1} . The face velocity of the air entering the mask of an
107 average person that has a breathing rate of ca 8 l min^{-1} and an average area for two nostrils of ca
108 700 mm^2 is calculated to be ca 0.38 m s^{-1} per nostril or 0.19 m s^{-1} per breath (Schriever *et al.*,
109 2013). The later values are similar to the instrumental sampling "face velocity". The sampling
110 face velocity directly affects the separation factor N_s , which in turn is directly related to a filter
111 efficiency: $N_s = \rho D^2 V / 18 \mu D_b$; where ρ = particle density, D = particle diameter D_b = fiber
112 diameter and μ = kinematic viscosity of air (Langmuir and Blodgett, 1946; De Nevers, 2010). If
113 the other parameters of the above equation remain constant, then the critical parameter in the
114 evaluation of filter efficiency in near realistic conditions, is the face velocity of the air stream that
115 carries the bioaerosol and "hits" the filtering area.

116 The eight (8) commercially available masks were examined for their efficiency in withholding
117 airborne particles of sizes 0.006 to 10 µm in 102 size bins. This filtration efficiency (FE) was
118 calculated for the number concentration of particles, by the following equation:

119

$$120 \quad FE = \frac{C_{BG} - C_M}{C_{BG}}$$

121 (1)

122 where, in each size bin, the C_{BG} (BG= background) was the average particle number
123 concentration before putting the mask on the inlet, whilst C_M is the average particle
124 concentrations per size bin when the instrument sampled indoor air that passed through the mask
125 (M= filtered through the mask).

126

127 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

128

129 *Filtration efficiency of the different masks*

130 An average PM size distribution before putting the mask on the inlet of the instrument and
131 when the mask was in place are presented in Fig. 2, for two examined masks, as an example of
132 low and high FE. The particle size distributions in the room indicate that the larger number
133 concentrations of the sampled aerosol can be found in the 20-350 nanometre scale, an area where
134 peak concentration of SARS-CoV-2 particles were observed (Liu *et al.*, 2020).

135 Fig. 3 compares the FE for all the masks under study. The 102 size bins were reduced to 14
136 bins for each examined mask for reasons of clarity. In the Fig.3, the superimposed rectangle
137 shadowed part, aims to highlight the size range where the higher number concentration of SARS
138 –CoV-2 can be found (Liu *et al.*, 2020). The simple cloth mask F1 (with two layers of cotton, like
139 the home made masks) has the lowest FE from all, in agreement with other studies (Rengasamy
140 *et al.*, 2010; Davies *et al.*, 2013; Cherrie *et al.*, 2018; Konda *et al.*, 2020). The addition of
141 activated carbon in a cotton mask, the F2 in our case, improves significantly its FE (Fig. 3(a)).
142 The FE of the masks M1, M2 (no brand name) is between F1 and F2, but they exhibited a larger
143 FE than F1 and F2 for particle sizes above 800 nm. In the Fig.3(b) the masks with better FEs than
144 the masks in Fig 3a. are presented. The M6 has FE above 90% in all size bins. The M6 is a KN95
145 mask similar with the standard N95 mask in US. It appears that apart from the M6, the other
146 masks are more or less permeable to the aerosol in the range 250-500 nm. Note that that the
147 masks that public wears, very rarely fit well in their face. This leads to a further significant
148 reduction of the mask effectiveness and hence to the protection against viruses (Cherrie *et al.*,
149 2018; Dbouk and Drikakis, 2020; Konda *et al.*, 2020; Perić and Perić, 2020).

150 The present findings are consistent with the reported results in other studies that have examined
151 the FE in relation with particle size distribution, for example the study of Konda *et al.*, (2020) or

152 older studies such as the study of (Mueller *et al.*, 2018), despite the differences in the setup of the
153 experiments of each study, for example artificial aerosol versus real indoor aerosol.

154 *Aerosol dynamics*

155 There exists a number of recent publications that discuss and confirm the transmission of viruses
156 and of SARS-CoV-2 via the atmosphere (Yu *et al.*, 2004; Kim *et al.*, 2016; Kutter *et al.*, 2018;
157 Tellier *et al.*, 2019; Anderson *et al.*, 2020; Asadi *et al.*, 2020; Fears *et al.*, 2020; Lednicky *et al.*,
158 2020; Prather *et al.*, 2020). The major parameters that were theoretically discussed below
159 concerning this transfer process, are the exit stopping distance of aerosol from the respiratory
160 processes, the gravitational settling velocity of aerosol (GSV) and the turbulence of the
161 environment that this transfer/infection may take place. The GSV of particles in free air that are
162 relevant to the human respiratory system, after incorporating the Cunningham Correction (slip)
163 Factor can be in simple terms be calculated via the following equation, extracted from the tables
164 of the following publications (Crowder *et al.*, 2002; Kulkarni *et al.*, 2011), (see also
165 Supplementary Material).

166

$$167 \log \text{GSV} = 0.1745 * (\log \text{particle diameter})^2 + 1.7573 * \log(\text{particle diameter}) - 2.4419$$

168 (2)

169 Aerosol exhaled, from the respiration process, breathing, talking, sneezing or coughing, acquires
170 a horizontal travel distance that depends on its diameter, density and exit velocity as it appears in
171 Equ. (3) (de Nevers 1995; Hinds, 201).

172

173 X stopping distance= $V_0 * D^2 * \rho_{part} * C / 18\mu$

174 (3)

175 where X is the Stokes law stopping distance, V_0 is the exit velocity of the particle, D is its
176 aerodynamic diameter, ρ_{part} is its density, C is the Cunningham Correction Factor (unity for
177 large particles) and μ is the kinematic viscosity of air.

178 Literature reports indicate that sneezing and coughing velocities of any density aerosol vary
179 between 5 and 30 $m s^{-1}$ (Stelzer & Braid *et al.*, 2009; Mittal *et al.*, 2020). Hence, the Stokes law
180 stopping distance of large aerosol can be calculated. If for example these aerosol have a diameter
181 of 50 μm and a density of 2 $kg m^{-3}$, the result is 46.3 cm, ignoring gravitational forces. If
182 sneezing and coughing aerosol is comprised of spherical aerosol and to a lesser extent by
183 coagulated filaments, it can travel for ca. 0.5 m. Practice, from time lapse and fast frame
184 recording cameras, indicates a slightly larger plume (Hsiao *et al.*, 2020).

185 Another factor that enters the equation of exhaled human plume is the behaviour of the aerosol in
186 an environment with relative humidity lower than that of the human lungs. The time it takes for a
187 single particle to dry depends on its diameter and density at certain temperature and humidity as
188 shown in Equ. (4) (Hinds, 2011).

189

$$T = \frac{R * \rho_{part} * D^2}{8 * D_{dif} * M * \left(\frac{p_d}{T_d} - \frac{p_{out}}{T_{out}} \right)}$$

190

191 (4)

192 where R= the universal gas constant; $\rho_{part}=2000 kg m^{-3}$; diameter of particle $D= 5 \times 10^{-5} m$;
193 diffusion coefficient for water $D_{dif} = 2.4 \times 10^{-5} m^2 s^{-1}$; M= molecular mass; temperature outside the
194 particle $T_{out}=293 K$; pressure outside the particle $p_{out}= 1170 Pa$; T_d on the surface of the particle

195 depends on the T_{out} and the saturation ratio of the particle at 293 K and finally p_d is the vapour
196 pressure of water at 293 K. Equ. (4) is valid without correction for particles larger than 2 μm .
197 Hence, an aqueous particle of 50 μm diameter after exhalation to 50% ambient relative humidity
198 has an evaporation time of ca. 12 seconds.

199 Theoretical considerations may also allow the calculation of the coagulation time of aerosol to
200 lower number concentrations of larger coagulated particles. However, these calculations are not
201 trivial and with large uncertainties in the outcome. It appears that only measurements in near real
202 environmental conditions will assess the atmospheric lifetime of the SARS-CoV-2 virus in a
203 specific examined environment. It may, thence, be possible to categorise its lifetime in
204 “generalised” environmental conditions. The above considerations indicate that the size
205 distribution of SARS-CoV-2 virus carrying aerosol, may spread across the size range important
206 for the human health. Hence, masks that available to the public must be efficient across the whole
207 of this size range 10 nm to 25 and 50 μm .

208 Another, unanswered and difficult to answer question remains the “infection dose” to the
209 recipients. Atmospheric concentrations of externally or internally mixed size segregated active
210 aerosol must be related to the time of exposure, a parameter directly related to aerosol lifetime.

211 Aerosol science has an important role to play in the understanding of the spread of viruses and the
212 selection of protective measures.

213

214 **CONCLUSIONS**

215

216 There exists ample evidence that viruses are transmitted via the atmosphere and this may be the
217 main transmission pathway. Deposition of exhaled viral aerosol on surfaces and transmission
218 after contact with surfaces, is a secondary but also important pathway. In the present work we

219 examined the efficiency of face masks, available to the public at low cost, for stopping aerosol in
220 the size range of 0.006 μm to 10 μm , in entering the individual's respiratory system. From the
221 aerosol science point of view, real aerosol was tested in our experiments, representative of a
222 naturally ventilated typical indoor environment. Only surgical masks of known origin, displayed
223 an acceptable efficiency across the aerosol range. Specifically, since the size of the airborne
224 SARS-CoV-2 virus displays a large number concentration around 100-350 nm before its
225 atmospheric aging, i.e. accumulation and coagulation, it was established that masks should be
226 highly efficient at this aerosol nanoscale range. Furthermore, the instrumental sampling face
227 velocity for the masks tested was similar to the "face velocity" of air entering the mask at a
228 typical human breathing rate. This ensured that our experiments were not biased or erroneous
229 because of "different/varying" face velocity parameter that affects the separation number (N_s) of
230 aerosol for a target (mask material) efficiency. The M6, a KN95 mask was the most efficient
231 across the examined range. Market available cloth masks were inefficient at any aerosol size
232 range. Epidemiological studies, the resulting damage due to the pandemic is established leaving a
233 number of unknown parameters of the "exactly how", unanswered. The application of aerosol
234 science and technology in infection control with extended, dedicated and organised research will
235 provide defensive measures against the next wave of virus infection. One such very important

236 measure (policy) would be the use by the public of surgical masks of known, tested and
237 standardized quality.

238

239 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

240

241 The present work was funded by Democritus University of Thrace (Greece) funds.

242

243 **DISCLAIMER**

244

245 Reference to any companies or specific commercial products does not constitute their
246 endorsement.

247

248 **REFERENCES**

- 249 Anderson, E.L., Turnham, P., Griffin, J.R. and Clarke, C.C. (2020). Consideration of the aerosol transmission for
250 covid-19 and public health. *Risk Anal.*
- 251 Asadi, S., Bouvier, N., Wexler, A.S. and Ristenpart, W.D. (2020a). The coronavirus pandemic and aerosols: Does
252 covid-19 transmit via expiratory particles? *Aerosol Sci. Technol.* 54: 635-638.
- 253 Asadi, S., Bouvier, N., Wexler, A.S. and Ristenpart, W.D. (2020b). The coronavirus pandemic and aerosols: Does
254 covid-19 transmit via expiratory particles?, Taylor & Francis.
- 255 Calvert, J.G. (1990). Glossary of atmospheric chemistry terms (recommendations 1990). *Pure Appl. Chem.* 62: 2167-
256 2219.
- 257 Centers for Disease Control Prevention, C.D.C. (2020). Recommendation regarding the use of cloth face coverings,
258 especially in areas of significant community-based transmission. *Colorado: CDC.*
- 259 Cherrie, J.W., Apsley, A., Cowie, H., Steinle, S., Mueller, W., Lin, C., Horwell, C.J., Sleeuwenhoek, A. and Loh, M.
260 (2018). Effectiveness of face masks used to protect beijing residents against particulate air pollution. *Occup.*
261 *Environ. Med.* 75: 446-452.
- 262 Crowder, T.M., Rosati, J.A., Schroeter, J.D., Hickey, A.J. and Martonen, T.B. (2002). Fundamental effects of
263 particle morphology on lung delivery: Predictions of stokes' law and the particular relevance to dry powder
264 inhaler formulation and development. *Pharm. Res.* 19: 239-245.

- 265 Davies, A., Thompson, K.-A., Giri, K., Kafatos, G., Walker, J. and Bennett, A. (2013). Testing the efficacy of
266 homemade masks: Would they protect in an influenza pandemic? *Disaster Med. Public Health Prep.* 7: 413-
267 418.
- 268 Dbouk, T. and Drikakis, D. (2020). On respiratory droplets and face masks. *Phys. Fluids* 32: 063303.
- 269 De Nevers, N. (2010). *Air pollution control engineering*, Second Edition ed. Waveland press, Long Grove IL.
- 270 Douwes, J., Eduard, W. and Thorne, P.S. (2008). Bioaerosols, In *International encyclopedia of public health*,
271 Heggenhougen, H.K. (Ed.), Academic Press, Oxford, pp. 287-297.
- 272 Drossinos, Y. and Stilianakis, N.I. (2020). What aerosol physics tells us about airborne pathogen transmission.
273 *Aerosol Sci. Technol.* 54: 639-643.
- 274 Fears, A.C., Klimstra, W.B., Duprex, P., Hartman, A., Weaver, S.C., Plante, K.S., Mirchandani, D., Plante, J.,
275 Aguilar, P.V. and Fernandez, D. (2020). Comparative dynamic aerosol efficiencies of three emergent
276 coronaviruses and the unusual persistence of sars-cov-2 in aerosol suspensions. *MedRxIV*.
- 277 Fineberg, H.V. (2020). Rapid expert consultation on the possibility of bioaerosol spread of sars-cov-2 for the covid-
278 19 pandemic (april 1, 2020), In *The national academies press nrc*, The National Academies Press, National
279 Research Council, Washington, DC.
- 280 Guzman, M. (2020). Bioaerosol size effect in covid-19 transmission.
- 281 Hinds, W.C. (2011). Physical and chemical processes in aerosol systems. *Aerosol Measurement: Principles,*
282 *Techniques, and Applications*: 31.
- 283 Hsiao, T.-C., Chuang, H.-C., Griffith, S.M., Chen, S.-J. and Young, L.-H. (2020). Covid-19: An aerosol's point of
284 view from expiration to transmission to viral-mechanism. *Aerosol and Air Quality Research* 20: 905-910.
- 285 Kim, S.-H., Chang, S.Y., Sung, M., Park, J.H., Bin Kim, H., Lee, H., Choi, J.-P., Choi, W.S. and Min, J.-Y. (2016).
286 Extensive viable middle east respiratory syndrome (mers) coronavirus contamination in air and surrounding
287 environment in mers isolation wards. *Rev. Infect. Dis.* 63: 363-369.
- 288 Konda, A., Prakash, A., Moss, G.A., Schmoldt, M., Grant, G.D. and Guha, S. (2020). Aerosol filtration efficiency of
289 common fabrics used in respiratory cloth masks. *ACS Nano*.
- 290 Kulkarni, P., Baron P. A. and Willeke K., 2011. Fundamentals of single particle transport, in: Kulkarni, P., Baron,
291 P.A. and Willeke, K. (Eds.) *Aerosol Measurement, Principles, Techniques, and Applications*, Third Edition,
292 *John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey*, pp 15-30., Baron, P.A. and Willeke, K. (2011).
- 293 Kunkel, S., Azimi, P., Zhao, H., Stark, B. and Stephens, B. (2017). Quantifying the size-resolved dynamics of
294 indoor bioaerosol transport and control. *Indoor Air* 27: 977-987.
- 295 Kutter, J.S., Spronken, M.I., Fraaij, P.L., Fouchier, R.A. and Herfst, S. (2018). Transmission routes of respiratory
296 viruses among humans. *Curr. Opin. Virol.* 28: 142-151.
- 297 Langmuir, I. (1946). A mathematical investigation of water droplet trajectories, Army Air Forces Headquarters, Air
298 Technical Service Command.
- 299 Lednický, J.A., Shankar, S.N., Elbadry, M.A., Gibson, J.C., Alam, M.M., Stephenson, C.J., Eiguren-Fernandez, A.,
300 Morris, J.G., Mavian, C.N., Salemi, M., Clugston, J.R. and Wu, C.-Y. (2020). Collection of sars-cov-2 virus

- 301 from the air of a clinic within a university student health care center and analyses of the viral genomic
302 sequence. *Aerosol and Air Quality Research* 20: 1167-1171.
- 303 Lee, J., Yoo, D., Ryu, S., Ham, S., Lee, K., Yeo, M., Min, K. and Yoon, C. (2019). Quantity, size distribution, and
304 characteristics of cough-generated aerosol produced by patients with an upper respiratory tract infection.
305 *Aerosol and Air Quality Research* 19: 840-853.
- 306 Liu, Y., Ning, Z., Chen, Y., Guo, M., Liu, Y., Gali, N.K., Sun, L., Duan, Y., Cai, J. and Westerdahl, D. (2020).
307 Aerodynamic analysis of sars-cov-2 in two wuhan hospitals. *Nature*: 1-4.
- 308 MacIntyre, C.R., Seale, H., Dung, T.C., Hien, N.T., Nga, P.T., Chughtai, A.A., Rahman, B., Dwyer, D.E. and Wang,
309 Q. (2015). A cluster randomised trial of cloth masks compared with medical masks in healthcare workers.
310 *BMJ open* 5: e006577.
- 311 Mittal, R., Ni, R. and Seo, J.-H. (2020). The flow physics of covid-19. *J. Fluid Mech.* 894: F2.
- 312 Morawska, L., Johnson, G.R., Ristovski, Z.D., Hargreaves, M., Mengersen, K., Corbett, S., Chao, C.Y.H., Li, Y. and
313 Katoshevski, D. (2009). Size distribution and sites of origin of droplets expelled from the human respiratory
314 tract during expiratory activities. *J. Aerosol Sci* 40: 256-269.
- 315 Mueller, W., Horwell, C.J., Apsley, A., Steinle, S., McPherson, S., Cherrie, J.W. and Galea, K.S. (2018). The
316 effectiveness of respiratory protection worn by communities to protect from volcanic ash inhalation. Part i:
317 Filtration efficiency tests. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* 221: 967-976.
- 318 Mutuku, J.K., Hou, W.-C. and Chen, W.-H. (2020). An overview of experiments and numerical simulations on
319 airflow and aerosols deposition in human airways and the role of bioaerosol motion in covid-19
320 transmission. *Aerosol and Air Quality Research* 20: 1172-1196.
- 321 National Academies of Sciences, E. and Medicine (2020). *Rapid expert consultations on the covid-19 pandemic:
322 March 14, 2020-april 8, 2020*. National Academies Press.
- 323 Nazaroff, W.W. (2016). Indoor bioaerosol dynamics. *Indoor Air* 26: 61-78.
- 324 Perić, R. and Perić, M. (2020). Analytical and numerical investigation of the airflow in face masks used for
325 protection against covid-19 virus—implications for mask design and usage. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.08800*.
- 326 Prather, K.A., Wang, C.C. and Schooley, R.T. (2020). Reducing transmission of sars-cov-2. *Science*: eabc6197.
- 327 Rengasamy, S., Eimer, B. and Shaffer, R.E. (2010). Simple respiratory protection—evaluation of the filtration
328 performance of cloth masks and common fabric materials against 20–1000 nm size particles. *Ann. Occup.
329 Hyg.* 54: 789-798.
- 330 Schriever, V.A., Hummel, T., Lundström, J.N. and Freiherr, J. (2013). Size of nostril opening as a measure of
331 intranasal volume. *Physiol. Behav.* 110: 3-5.
- 332 Steinle, S., Sleuwenhoek, A., Mueller, W., Horwell, C.J., Apsley, A., Davis, A., Cherrie, J.W. and Galea, K.S.
333 (2018). The effectiveness of respiratory protection worn by communities to protect from volcanic ash
334 inhalation. Part ii: Total inward leakage tests. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* 221: 977-984.
- 335 Stelzer□Braid, S., Oliver, B.G., Blazey, A.J., Argent, E., Newsome, T.P., Rawlinson, W.D. and Tovey, E.R. (2009).
336 Exhalation of respiratory viruses by breathing, coughing, and talking. *J. Med. Virol.* 81: 1674-1679.

337 Tellier, R., Li, Y., Cowling, B.J. and Tang, J.W. (2019). Recognition of aerosol transmission of infectious agents: A
338 commentary. *BMC Infect. Dis.* 19: 101.

339 WHO (2020). Getting your workplace ready for covid-19: How covid-19 spreads, 19 march 2020, World Health
340 Organization, Geneva.

341 Yao, M. (2018). Reprint of bioaerosol: A bridge and opportunity for many scientific research fields. *J. Aerosol Sci*
342 119: 91-96.

343 Yu, I.T., Li, Y., Wong, T.W., Tam, W., Chan, A.T., Lee, J.H., Leung, D.Y. and Ho, T. (2004). Evidence of airborne
344 transmission of the severe acute respiratory syndrome virus. *New Engl. J. Med.* 350: 1731-1739.

345

346

347

348

349 **Table 1.** Summary of the characteristics of each tested mask.

Mask	Brand	Description
M1	No available name	Face mask with stretchable elastic ear loops Soft-breathable-skin friendly, Effective protection Comfortable material BFE 95%
M2	No available name	Hygiene & Protection Face masks 3-Ply Disposable, PP non-woven
M3	HYGOSTAR	Face mask with ear loops, green, 3-ply, nickel-free Materials- outer layer: PP (polypropylene non-woven) fabric-like - middle layer / filter: melt blown - outer layer: PP (polypropylene non-woven) excellent filter performance > 99% BFE non sterile, lint-free, skin-friendly integrated nose bridge, adjustable anatomically
M4	YI HU KANG HEALTHY	Medical Face Mask Ear Loop 3 layer protective filtering ~ Anti-fog, Anti-droplet, Dust and Effective Filters bacterial <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inner Layer: Skin-Friendly and comfortable • Filter Layer: Filter oily and non-oily particles, antibacterial material • Outer Layer: Block larger particles • BFE=>95% <p>Material composition: Inner and outer premium polypropylene non-woven fabric, Middle antibacterial filter layer, 3-layer thickened protection design</p>
M5	ASEPTA	Surgical Face Mask Ear Loop For single use Hypoallergenic - 3ply Fiberglass free >95% B.F.E. Long integrated nose-piece Antibacterial filter between layers
M6	HENGHAO	Disposable 3 Layer Medical Face Mask with elastic ear loops KN95 (<i>Chinese standards for masks nearly equivalent on the features with the N95 based on US standards</i>) BFE>95% Effectively resists PM _{2.5} and protects against dust, smoke and microorganisms
F1	Greek product No available name	Face mask with stretchable elastic ear loops 100% cotton
F2	Greek product No available name	Face mask with stretchable elastic ear loops Cotton mask with activated carbon Multiuse

351

Figure Captions

352 **Fig. 1.** The aerosol sampling instrumentation where U-SMPS denotes the Universal Scanning
353 Mobility Particle Sizer control unit; DEMC denotes the Differential Electrical Mobility Classifier;
354 UF-CPC denotes the Universal Fluid - Condensation Particle Counter (butanol in the present case)
355 and PROMO 2000 denotes the Optical Scattering Particle Counter.


356 **Fig. 2.** Average PM number concentrations for a period of 30-min as recorded before and after
357 filtration through the mask. Diagram (a) indicates low efficiency and (b) high efficiency across
358 the size bin range indicated.

359 **Fig. 3.** Filtration Efficiency for all the masks under study for 14 size bins. The mask
360 nomenclature is the same as noted in Table 1.

361

362

363



364

365

366

367

368

369

370


371

372

373

374

Fig. 1.



375

376

377

378

Fig. 2.



379

380

Fig. 3.