

N95 Filtering Facepiece Respirators Remain Effective After Extensive Reuse During the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Valeria Fabre, MD^{1,2}, Sara E. Cosgrove, MD, MS^{1,2,4}, Yea-Jen Hsu, PhD³, George Jones, BS¹, Taylor Hessel⁴, James Bukowski, MS, CIH⁵, Mark Sobota, CSP⁵, Anna C. Sick-Samuels, MD, MPH^{2,6}, Aaron M. Milstone, MD, MHS^{2,4,6}, Lisa L. Maragakis, MD, MPH^{1,2,4}, Clare Rock, MD, MS^{1,2,4}, for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Epicenters Program.

¹Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, ²Department of Hospital Epidemiology and Infection Control, The Johns Hopkins Hospital, ³Department of Health Policy and Management, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, ⁴Johns Hopkins Armstrong Institute for Patient Safety and Quality, ⁵Department of Health, Safety & Environment, The Johns Hopkins Hospital, ⁶Department of Pediatrics, Division of Infectious Diseases, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland.

Corresponding author:

Valeria Fabre, M.D.

Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine

Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases

600 North Wolfe Street, Osler 421

Baltimore, Maryland 21287

mfabre1@jhmi.edu

Abstract

In a cross-sectional evaluation of healthcare worker reuse of their own 3M N95 respirators, 83% (76/92) passed the seal check and the fit-test after a median of 40 repeated donnings. The user seal-check had 31% sensitivity to detect N95 respirator failure but 100% specificity.

Background

The SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) pandemic has led to a widespread critical shortage of N95 respirators^{1,2}. One conservation strategy is having healthcare workers (HCWs) reuse their own N95. Data on the safe number of N95 reuses before filtration failure is lacking. Based on a study in a simulated environment, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) suggests limiting the number of reuses to five per N95 to ensure an adequate safety margin³; however, such approach likely leads to discard of clinically effective N95s earlier than necessary⁴. Our primary objective was to evaluate effectiveness of reused N95s in a real-world healthcare setting during the COVID-19 pandemic. A secondary objective was to identify factors that could be used to proactively identify N95 failure.

Methods

Study setting

The Johns Hopkins Hospital (JHH), a 1,162-bed academic hospital in Baltimore, MD, recommends N95 respirators for any interaction with confirmed or suspected SARS-CoV-2 infected patients and when performing aerosol generating procedures for all patients, regardless of SARS-CoV-2 status. To preserve N95 supplies HCWs reuse their own N95s (covered with a face shield) until it must be discarded due to concern for compromised structural or functional integrity, as determined by visual inspection and a user performed seal check before every donning.

Study design, participants, and definitions

We conducted a cross-sectional evaluation of reused N95 effectiveness during July and August 2020 in clinical areas dedicated for care of patients with known or suspected COVID-19: the Emergency Department and five inpatient units. On the day of the N95 assessment, participating HCWs were asked questions about reuse of their N95s included number of shifts worked with the current N95, average number of donnings per shift, longest number of hours and method for storing the N95. Questions were answered based on best HCWs' recall.

Following the questionnaire, each N95 had a 3-step effectiveness screening: first, an inspection for structural damage (i.e., non-intact nosepiece or head straps, visible soilage), second, a user seal test to assess for air leakage during inhalation and exhalation, third a qualitative fit-testing with standard Saccharin Solution Aerosol Protocol performed by the study team⁵. Any N95 that failed the seal check or the saccharine fit-test was further evaluated with a confirmatory quantitative fit-test using the ambient aerosol condensation nuclei counter (PortaCount[®]) protocol^{6,7}. A fit factor result on this protocol of < 100 is considered a failure. Due to constraints on N95 supply we used the quantitative method to evaluate only those N95s that failed a screening test as the PortaCount test requires insertion of a probe through the N95 to count particles rendering the N95 unusable. At the time of the study, the only available N95 models at our institution were 3M 1860 (dome-shape) and 3M 1870 (duck-bill). HCWs who failed the fit-test were given a new N95. The study was approved by JHM IRB.

Statistical analysis

The primary outcome was a confirmed N95 failure, defined as failure of one or more screening tests followed by failure of the quantitative fit-test. Secondary outcomes included factors

associated with failure, accuracy of the user seal check in detecting fit-failures. Fisher's exact and Wilcoxon-rank sum tests were used to evaluate categorical and continuous variables. The relationship between number of repeated N95 donnings and N95 failure was assessed by Kaplan-Meier curves where survival was considered N95 passing. We conducted a sensitivity analysis including the N95s that failed a screening test (seal check or saccharin fit-test) but did not have a confirmatory PortaCount fit-test as failures. Based on data from preliminary observations, with 95% confidence interval and an error margin of two the required sample size was 77 HCWs. A 2-sided P value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. Analyses were performed using StataCorp 2019 (College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC).

Results

Of 99 recruited HCWs, 92 had complete follow up (**Figure**) and were included in the primary analysis. The overall median number of self-reported N95 donnings at the time of the assessment of these 92 HCWs was 40 (IQR 17 – 100) and the median for the reported longest number of hours that the N95 was kept on once donned was 2.5 hours (IQR 1 – 2.5). All N95s ($n=92$) were structurally intact upon visual inspection, 80% (74/92) passed both the seal check and the saccharine fit-test, while 2 HCWs passed the seal check, failed the saccharine but passed the PortaCount fit-test (**Figure**), resulting in an overall pass rate of 83% (76/92) and a primary outcome of N95 failure in 17% (16/92) of N95s. Physicians and advanced practitioners were more likely to pass the fit-test (95%) compared to other roles (81% of bedside nurses, 66% technicians, $P<0.01$), **Table**. There was no difference by 3M N95 type, number of donnings, or

reported folding of the N95 during storage, between N95s that did and did not pass the assessment.

All N95s donned fewer than 12 times passed, and the probability of N95s maintaining a good fit was >95% for up to 23 donnings and >90% for up to 31 donnings (**Supplementary Figure 1 and Supplementary Table 1**).

The sensitivity of the user seal check to detect N95 fit-failure was 31% (5/16) and the specificity was 100% (5/5).

Cohort characteristics and N95 use factors associated with N95 failure remained similar in a sensitivity analysis that included 7 HCWs who failed a screening test and lacked confirmatory PortaCount data as failures (**Supplementary Table 2**). One HCW failed the seal check after 6 donnings. Like in the primary analysis, there were no saccharin failures before 12 donnings among HCWs who had passed a seal check and the probability of the N95 passing a fit check was >95% up to 16 repeated donnings and >90% up to 23 donnings (**Supplementary Table 3**).

Discussion

This cross-sectional evaluation of HCWs reusing their own 3M N95s until visibly damaged, soiled or structurally unsound during the COVID-19 pandemic found that 83% were still effective as measured by fit-testing after a median of 40 reuses.

The user seal-check identified 31% of non-effective N95s with 100% specificity. This finding demonstrates the value of the user seal check, a simple, non-invasive fit check, recommended at each donning to identify gross leakage of air. The minimum reuse of N95s that passed the

seal-check but failed the saccharin and PortaCount fit-test (covert N95 failures) was 12 times. Only certain HCW roles were associated with N95 failure, further evaluation including N95 reuse patterns would be needed to better understand this observation. We estimated the probability of N95s remaining effective at incremental N95 donnings and found that was >95% of N95 would maintain an adequate fit for up to 23 donnings and >90% for up to 31 donnings. Hence, these data suggest that, if critical N95 shortages exist, with an effective seal on donning, HCWs can safely reuse their N95s many times more than the number currently suggested by the CDC³.

Our study has limitations. We did not perform a PortaCount on N95s that passed the seal check or the saccharine fit-test due to limited N95 supplies and we may have overestimated “passes”; however, false passes are infrequent with the saccharin method⁸. Although we evaluated two of the most commonly used N95 respirators in the United States⁹, findings may not be generalizable to alternative models. The number of repeated N95 donnings was based on HCW recall, which may have been under- or over-estimated; however, we do not think there was bias in either direction. We did not sample the N95s to assess for pathogen contamination, a risk of N95 reuse, but our protocol of face shield to protect N95 reduces this risk by preventing droplets from landing on the respirator surface. This study was not powered to assess effectiveness of N95s to prevent SARS-COV-2 infection or other potentially airborne transmitted infections. Notably, no patient-to-HCW SARS-COV-2 transmissions have been documented for HCWs who complied with the recommended COVID-19 precautions at JHH to date (authors’ personal communication). There was missing PortaCount data from some HCWs

who failed the seal check or saccharine fit-test; however, we performed a sensitivity analysis to minimize the impact of missing data on interpretation of the study results.

In summary, extensive reuse of the N95 models tested in our study seems an acceptable and safe approach during critical supply shortages rather than uniform discarding of N95s after the currently suggested 5 reuses³ as long as HCWs consistently perform a seal check and obtain a good seal before donning a reused N95 respirator. Consideration could be given to offering regular interval saccharine fit-testing when reusing N95s to enhance HCW comfort and safety with respirator reuse.

Acknowledgements: We thank Alejandra B. Salinas for technical assistance and JHH HCWs for their participation in the study.

Funding: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Epicenter Program, COVID-19 supplement to grant 6 U01CK000554-02-02.

References

1. Ranney ML, Griffeth V, Jha AK. Critical Supply Shortages - The Need for Ventilators and Personal Protective Equipment during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(18):e41.

2. Rebmann T, Vassallo A, Holdsworth JE. Availability of personal protective equipment and infection prevention supplies during the first month of the COVID-19 pandemic: A national study by the APIC COVID-19 task force. *Am J Infect Control*. 2020.
3. CDC. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/respirators-strategy/index.html>. Accessed November 24th 2020.
4. Bergman MS, Viscusi DJ, Zhuang Z, Palmiero AJ, Powell JB, Shaffer RE. Impact of multiple consecutive donnings on filtering facepiece respirator fit. *Am J Infect Control*. 2012;40(4):375-380.
5. <https://www.osha.gov/laws-regs/regulations/standardnumber/1910/1910.134AppA>.
6. <https://www.tsi.com/getmedia/e39e2877-cf0d-43d3-8667-b8041f94df55/PortaCount2980083RevE?ext=.pdf>.
7. Coffey CC, Lawrence RB, Zhuang Z, Campbell DL, Jensen PA, Myers WR. Comparison of five methods for fit-testing N95 filtering-facepiece respirators. *Appl Occup Environ Hyg*. 2002;17(10):723-730.
8. Coffey CC, Lawrence RB, Zhuang Z, Duling MG, Campbell DL. Errors associated with three methods of assessing respirator fit. *J Occup Environ Hyg*. 2006;3(1):44-52.
9. Wizner K, Stradtman L, Novak D, Shaffer R. Prevalence of Respiratory Protective Devices in U.S. Health Care Facilities: Implications for Emergency Preparedness. *Workplace Health Saf*. 2016;64(8):359-368.


Table: Participant characteristics and frequency of repeated N95 use by single healthcare workers.

Cohort characteristics	All N=92	N95 pass N= 76	N95 failure N=16	P value
Gender, n (%)				0.45
Female	77 (84)	69 (82)	15 (94)	
Male	15 (16)	14 (18)	1 (6)	
Role, n (%)				0.01
Physician/Advanced practitioner	22 (24)	21 (28)	1 (6)	
Nurse	54 (59)	44 (58)	10 (63)	
Technician	10 (11)	5 (7)	5 (31)	
Other	6 (6)	6 (8)	0	
Mask type, n (%)				1.00
3M 1860	72 (78%)	59 (78)	13 (81)	
3M 1870	20 (22)	17 (22)	3 (19)	
N95 use				
Fold N95 for storage, n (%)				0.47
No	62 (67)	50 (66)	12 (75)	
Yes	30 (33)	26 (34)	4 (25)	
Visual Inspection, n (%)				0.65
Not creased	83 (90)	69 (91)	10 (62)	
Creased	9 (10)	7 (9)	6 (38)	
Duration of N95 reuse, n (%)				0.11
< 1 week	7 (8)	7 (9)	0	
1-4 weeks	33 (36)	24 (32)	9 (56)	
>4 weeks	52 (56)	45 (59)	7 (44)	
N95 donnings, median (IQR)	40 (17.5-100)	50 (20-120)	40 (16 -82)	0.39

Longest hours N95 worn once donned, median (IQR)	2.5 (1-2.5)	2.5 (1-2.5)	2.5 (1-3.5)	0.43
--	-------------	-------------	-------------	------


IQR: interquartile range.

Figure: Flow diagram of recruited healthcare workers who reused N95s during the COVID-19 pandemic.



SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Supplementary Figure 1: Probability of N95 maintaining a good fit after incremental donnings.



Supplementary Table 1: Probability of N95 maintaining a good fit with incremental donnings.

Interval	Total	Failures per donning interval	Pass with no subsequent follow up	Passing	Error	95% Confidence Interval
1 2	92	0	3	1	0	. .
3 4	89	0	1	1	0	. .
4 5	88	0	1	1	0	. .
5 6	87	0	1	1	0	. .
7 8	86	0	1	1	0	. .
10 11	85	0	6	1	0	. .
12 13	79	1	4	1	0.0129	0.9114 0.9982
15 16	74	0	1	0.9870	0.0129	0.9114 0.9982
17 18	73	1	2	0.9733	0.0186	0.8974 0.9933
20 21	70	1	2	0.9592	0.0231	0.8787 0.9867
22 23	67	0	1	0.9592	0.0231	0.8787 0.9867
24 25	66	2	2	0.9297	0.0304	0.8390 0.9702
25 26	62	1	0	0.9147	0.0334	0.8196 0.9608
28 29	61	0	1	0.9147	0.0334	0.8196 0.9608
30 31	60	0	2	0.9147	0.0334	0.8196 0.9608
33 34	58	1	0	0.8989	0.0363	0.7992 0.9506
35 36	57	1	2	0.8829	0.0391	0.7788 0.9398
36 37	54	0	3	0.8829	0.0391	0.7788 0.9398
37 38	51	0	1	0.8829	0.0391	0.7788 0.9398
39 40	50	1	0	0.8652	0.0421	0.7560 0.9278
40 41	49	0	2	0.8652	0.0421	0.7560 0.9278

42 43	47	0	1	0.8652	0.0421	0.7560 0.9278
45 46	46	0	3	0.8652	0.0421	0.7560 0.9278
48 49	43	0	1	0.8652	0.0421	0.7560 0.9278
49 50	42	0	1	0.8652	0.0421	0.7560 0.9278
50 51	41	1	2	0.8436	0.0463	0.7261 0.9136
52 53	38	0	1	0.8436	0.0463	0.7261 0.9136
60 61	37	1	1	0.8205	0.0504	0.6950 0.8980
63 64	35	0	2	0.8205	0.0504	0.6950 0.8980
66 67	33	0	1	0.8205	0.0504	0.6950 0.8980
70 71	32	0	2	0.8205	0.0504	0.6950 0.8980
73 74	30	0	1	0.8205	0.0504	0.6950 0.8980
75 76	29	0	1	0.8205	0.0504	0.6950 0.8980
80 81	28	0	2	0.8205	0.0504	0.6950 0.8980
84 85	26	0	1	0.8205	0.0504	0.6950 0.8980
100 101	25	1	0	0.7876	0.0581	0.6456 0.8779

Supplementary Table 2. Participant characteristics and fit pass rate on a sensitivity analysis where the seven healthcare workers who failed the seal check or the saccharin fit-test and had missing confirmatory PortaCount data are considered failures.

Cohort characteristics	All, n=99	Failure, n=23	Pass, n = 76	P value
Gender, n (%)				
Female	82	20 (87)	62 (82)	0.54
Male	17	3 (13)	14 (18)	
Role, n (%)				
Physician/Advanced practitioner	24	3 (13)	21 (28)	0.10
Nurse	56	12 (53)	44 (58)	
Technician	10	5 (50)	5 (50)	
Other	9	3 (13)	6 (8)	
Mask type, n (%)				
3M 1860	74	15 (65)	59 (78)	0.23
3M 1870	25	8 (35)	17 (22)	
N95 use characteristics				
Fold N95 for storage, n (%)				
No	68	12(18)	56 (82)	0.25
Yes	31	5 (22)	26 (34)	
User seal check, n (%)				
Fail	9	9 (39)	0	<0.01
Pass	90	14 (61)	76 (100)	
Duration N95 reuse, n (%)				
< 1 week	9	2 (9)	7 (9)	0.38
1-2 weeks	18	7 (30)	11 (14)	
>2-4 weeks	16	3 (13)	13 (17)	
> 4 weeks	56	11 (45)	45 (59)	
Number of repeated donnings, median (IQR)	43.5 (20-102)	33 (17.5-60)	45 (20-115)	0.28
Longest hours N95 worn after donning, median (IQR)	2.5 (1-2.5)	2.5 (1-2.5)	2.5 (1-2.5)	0.51

IQR: interquartile range.

Supplementary Table 3: Probability of passing the fit-test based on 23 failures (in this sensitivity analysis, the seven N95s that failed either the seal check or the saccharin test and that were not confirmed with PortaCount fit-test are considered failures).

Interval	Total	Failures per donning interval	Pass with no subsequent follow up	Passing	Error	95% Confidence Interval
1 2	99	0	3	1.0000	0.0000	..
3 4	96	0	1	1.0000	0.0000	..
4 5	95	0	1	1.0000	0.0000	..
5 6	94	0	1	1.0000	0.0000	..
7 8	93	1	1	0.9892	0.0108	0.9257 0.9985
10 11	91	0	6	0.9892	0.0108	0.9257 0.9985
11 12	85	1	0	0.9776	0.0157	0.9131 0.9943
12 13	84	1	4	0.9656	0.0195	0.8971 0.9888
14 15	79	1	0	0.9534	0.0228	0.8804 0.9823
15 16	78	0	1	0.9534	0.0228	0.8804 0.9823
17 18	77	2	2	0.9283	0.0283	0.8471 0.9672
20 21	73	1	2	0.9154	0.0307	0.8305 0.9588
21 22	70	1	0	0.9023	0.0329	0.8138 0.9500
22 23	69	0	1	0.9023	0.0329	0.8138 0.9500
24 25	68	2	2	0.8754	0.0370	0.7803 0.9311
25 26	64	1	0	0.8617	0.0389	0.7637 0.9212
28 29	63	0	1	0.8617	0.0389	0.7637 0.9212
30 31	62	0	2	0.8617	0.0389	0.7637 0.9212
33 34	60	1	0	0.8474	0.0408	0.7462 0.9106
35 36	59	1	2	0.8328	0.0426	0.7286 0.8996
36 37	56	0	3	0.8328	0.0426	0.7286 0.8996
37 38	53	0	1	0.8328	0.0426	0.7286 0.8996
39 40	52	1	0	0.8167	0.0447	0.7089 0.8877
40 41	51	0	2	0.8167	0.0447	0.7089 0.8877
42 43	49	0	1	0.8167	0.0447	0.7089 0.8877

45 46	48	0	3	0.8167	0.0447	0.7089 0.8877
48 49	45	0	1	0.8167	0.0447	0.7089 0.8877
49 50	44	0	1	0.8167	0.0447	0.7089 0.8877
50 51	43	2	2	0.7779	0.0503	0.6595 0.8593
52 53	39	0	1	0.7779	0.0503	0.6595 0.8593
56 57	38	1	0	0.7574	0.0530	0.6343 0.8440
60 61	37	1	1	0.7366	0.0555	0.6093 0.8281
63 64	35	0	2	0.7366	0.0555	0.6093 0.8281
66 67	33	0	1	0.7366	0.0555	0.6093 0.8281
70 71	32	0	2	0.7366	0.0555	0.6093 0.8281
73 74	30	0	1	0.7366	0.0555	0.6093 0.8281
75 76	29	0	1	0.7366	0.0555	0.6093 0.8281
80 81	28	0	2	0.7366	0.0555	0.6093 0.8281
84 85	26	0	1	0.7366	0.0555	0.6093 0.8281
100 101	25	1	0	0.7072	0.0606	0.5698 0.8078
105 106	24	0	1	0.7072	0.0606	0.5698 0.8078
115 116	23	0	1	0.7072	0.0606	0.5698 0.8078
120 121	22	1	2	0.6735	0.0664	0.5249 0.7847
122 123	19	1	1	0.6371	0.0721	0.4784 0.7591
133 134	17	0	1	0.6371	0.0721	0.4784 0.7591
156 157	16	0	1	0.6371	0.0721	0.4784 0.7591
162 163	15	0	1	0.6371	0.0721	0.4784 0.7591
180 181	14	1	1	0.5899	0.0807	0.4158 0.7280