

1 **Title:** Use, reuse or discard: quantitatively defined variance in N95 respirator integrity following
2 vaporized hydrogen peroxide decontamination during the COVID-19 pandemic

3
4 **Authors:** Carly Levine^{1,2†}, Courtney Grady^{1,2†}, Thomas Block^{1,3}, Harry Hurley¹, Riccardo Russo¹,
5 Blas Peixoto¹, Alexis Frees^{1,3}, Alejandro Ruiz^{1,3}, David Alland¹

6 †These authors contributed equally.

7 **Affiliations:**

- 8 1. Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Newark NJ, USA
9 2. Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences, Newark NJ, USA
10 3. Rutgers Environmental Health and Safety, Newark NJ, USA

11

12 **Corresponding author:**

13 David Alland

14 International Center for Public Health

15 225 Warren Street

16 Room: RBL 2232

17 Newark, NJ 07103

18 973-972-2179

19 allandda@njms.rutgers.edu

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 **SUMMARY**

28 **Background:** COVID-19 has stretched the ability of many institutions to supply needed
29 personal protective equipment, especially N95 respirators. N95 decontamination and reuse
30 programs provide one potential solution to this problem. Unfortunately, a comprehensive
31 evaluation of the effects of decontamination on the integrity of various N95 models using a
32 quantitative fit test (QTFT) approach is lacking. **Aims:** 1) To investigate the effects of up to eight
33 rounds of vaporized H₂O₂ (VHP) decontamination on the integrity of N95 respirators currently in
34 use in a hospital setting. 2) To examine if N95 respirators worn by one user can adapt to the
35 face shape of a second user with no compromise of integrity following VHP decontamination.
36 **Methods:** The PortaCount Pro+ Respirator Fit Tester Model 8038 was used to quantitatively
37 define the integrity, measured by fit, of N95 respirators following decontamination with VHP.
38 **Findings:** There was an observable downward trend in the integrity of Halyard Fluidshield
39 46727 N95 respirators throughout eight cycles of decontamination with VHP. The integrity of 3M
40 1870 N95 respirators was significantly reduced after the respirator was worn, decontaminated
41 with VHP, and then quantitatively fit tested on a second user. Furthermore, we uncovered
42 inconsistencies between qualitative fit test and QTFT results that may have strong implications
43 on the fit testing method used by institutions. **Conclusions:** Our data revealed variability in the
44 integrity of different N95 models after VHP decontamination and exposed potential limitations of
45 N95 decontamination and reuse programs.

46 **Keywords:** COVID-19, N95, respirator, decontamination, quantitative fit test

47
48
49
50
51

52 INTRODUCTION

53 As of August 2020, over 21.7 million people have been infected and more than 770,000
54 have died from COVID-19 worldwide [1]. Healthcare workers are at high risk of contracting
55 COVID-19 [2-4], making personal protective equipment (PPE), including N95 respirators, critical
56 for their protection. Many hospitals have universally implemented the use of N95 respirators
57 during routine care to limit exposure to mild and asymptomatic individuals and during aerosol-
58 producing procedures, such as intubation and mechanical ventilation [5,6]. This increase in use
59 has left many hospitals struggling to maintain adequate stock of N95 respirators in the face of
60 increasing supply chain shortages [7-10].

61 Decontamination and reuse of N95 respirators is a potential solution for alleviating
62 respirator scarcity during the COVID-19 pandemic as per the Occupational Safety and Health
63 Administration's (OSHA) recently updated guidelines [11]. Previous studies have validated the
64 use of vaporized hydrogen peroxide (VHP) [12], moist heat [13], dry heat [14], or ultraviolet
65 germicidal radiation [15] for decontamination of N95 respirators. The integrity of decontaminated
66 N95 respirators, measured by fit, must be maintained following processing. Proper fit is defined
67 as an intact, airtight seal against the user's face that can be measured using either a qualitative
68 fit test (QLFT) or a quantitative fit test (QTFT), as defined by Appendix A of the OSHA Standard
69 1920.134 [16]. A QTFT more accurately identifies proper fit than a QLFT [17,18]. However, an
70 N95 respirator that is tested using a QTFT cannot be subsequently worn for future protection
71 because this procedure requires puncturing a hole into the respirator to assess fit. On the other
72 hand, N95 respirators examined via a QLFT can be kept and used by the wearer after the test is
73 completed.

74 Current decontamination studies only use a manikin head form to quantitatively assess fit
75 factor and fail to evaluate all respirator models used in hospital settings [19,20]. However, product
76 scarcity has required the use of many different N95 models, most of which have not been
77 evaluated after decontamination. Additionally, it can be challenging to develop and maintain

78 systems which ensure that respirators are returned to their original user, as opposed to returning
79 the same model but from a different user post-decontamination. Yet, the integrity of N95
80 respirators worn by multiple persons has not been investigated.

81 Here, we first evaluated the number and type of N95 respirators qualitatively fit tested
82 and distributed by University Hospital (UH) in Newark, NJ before and during the COVID-19
83 pandemic. We then used QTFTs to assess the integrity of 4/7 of these N95 models following
84 sequential rounds of decontamination with VHP. The integrity of decontaminated N95
85 respirators was then tested on a second user using a QTFT approach. Finally, we evaluated the
86 reliability of qualitative fit testing on models that we found were hard to fit quantitatively by
87 comparing QLFT vs. QTFT results. Our findings revealed that the majority of N95 respirators
88 evaluated were able to withstand the VHP decontamination process and that these N95
89 respirators could be returned to new users with no significant decrease in integrity. However, we
90 did observe exceptions to these findings that may have strong implications on which respirator
91 models are suitable for decontamination and reuse programs. Furthermore, differences in QLFT
92 and QTFT results for certain respirator models uncovered potential weaknesses in using QLFTs
93 for measuring the protective ability of N95 respirators.

94 **METHODS**

95 **Human subjects approval.** Experiments involving fit testing and decontamination of N95
96 respirators was part of the public health response to the COVID-19 pandemic and were thus
97 considered exempt from institutional review board approval. All participants gave informed
98 consent prior to participating in any experiments.

99 **N95 Decontamination.** Respirators were decontaminated using VHP which was delivered via
100 the Steris VHP system (Steris Life Sciences, Mentor, OH). Respirator hanging and
101 decontamination was similar to previously published studies [12].

102 **Fit Testing.** Fit testing was administered following OSHA standard Appendix A to 1920.134 with
103 minor modifications: 1) N95 respirators tested using both QLFTs and QTFTs underwent QLFTs

104 first, 2) QLFT users were blinded to the order by which qualitative testing was administered
105 (sweet followed by bitter). All users were deemed medically able to complete fit testing
106 beforehand.

107 **Qualitative fit testing:** The 3M Qualitative Fit Test Apparatus FT-30, Bitter (denatonium
108 benzoate) 1 kit and 3M Qualitative Fit Test Apparatus FT-10, Sweet (saccharine) kit (3M, Saint
109 Paul, MN) were used for QLFTs. These kits included a hood, collar, and nebulizers which were
110 used to aerosolize the tasting solution. All users were sensitive to tasting agents.

111 **Quantitative fit testing:** The QTFTs were administered using a PortaCount Pro+ Respirator Fit
112 Tester Model 8038 with an N95-Companion™ Fit N95 Tester Model 8026 Particle Generator
113 (TSI, Shoreview, MN). Respirators were punctured with custom grommet sampling probes to
114 connect a sampling tube between the inside of an N95 respirator and the PortaCount Pro+
115 machine. Sodium chloride tablets were used for particle generation. All testing was conducted
116 above the minimum recommendations of 70 ambient particles/cc and a passing test required a
117 fit factor of ≥ 100 . Fit factors were calculated by the apparatus from the ratio of particles outside
118 to particles inside the respirator.

119 **Second user N95 respirators.** Respirators that had previously failed a QLFT were termed
120 “lightly used” because even though the nosepiece had been fit and shaped to a user’s face, the
121 respirator did not undergo the extended wear that is representative of a long hospital shift.
122 These lightly used N95 respirators were used for second user experiments.

123 **Respirator sizing.** All respirators used except Kimberly Clark/Halyard Fluidshield (Halyard
124 Fluidshield) and 3M 1860 were available in one size only. Halyard Fluidshield N95 respirators
125 were available in small (46827) and regular (46727) sizes. 3M 1860 N95 respirators were also
126 available in small (1860S) and regular (1860) sizes. For these models, the appropriate size was
127 determined for each participant using a QTFT before the start of the study. The correct size was
128 then used for each subject in all experiments.

129 **Statistical analysis**

130 To analyze the effect of decontamination on N95 integrity we used a one tailed Kruskal-Wallis
131 test. A one-tailed Mann-Whitney U test was used to assess the differences between N95
132 respirators worn by one user and N95 respirators worn by a second user following
133 decontamination. All statistical analysis was run using Prism 8 software.

134 **RESULTS**

135 **Respirator models and fit testing have increased during the COVID-19 pandemic in a**
136 **hospital setting.** To define the scope of our targeted decontamination study, we examined the
137 use of N95 respirators at UH before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. The frequency of
138 QLFTs in 2020 from January to May was about tenfold greater than the average monthly
139 frequency from 2014 to 2019 (Figure 1A). Over 99% of fit testing conducted before 2020 was on
140 one of four N95 models, Halyard Fluidshield 46727/46827 (59.59%), 3M 1860/3M1860S
141 (25.75%), 3M 1870 (8.68%), and Cardinal Health (5.79%) (Figure 1B). In addition to these
142 models, Gerson 2130 (15.4%), Gerson 1730 (5.38%), and 3M 9210 (4.93%) were introduced
143 during January to May 2020 (Figure 1B). However, Halyard Fluidshield 46727/46827 (21.97%),
144 3M 1860/3M 1860S (17.64%), 3M 1870 (13%), and Cardinal Health (21.23%) still comprised the
145 majority of the respirators distributed (Figure 1B). Overall, we observed an increase in the
146 diversity, fit test frequency, and use of N95 respirators during the COVID-19 pandemic.

147 **Variation in quantitative fit testing across different N95 models.** Prior to any VHP
148 decontamination, we conducted QTFTs on the seven N95 models used at UH during the
149 COVID-19 pandemic (Figure 2). We defined a QTFT fit factor of ≥ 100 to be a passing value.
150 Users who passed a QTFT were considered certified to use the N95 model tested. Respirator
151 models with high frequency of passing across different users were 3M 1860/3M 1860S, 3M
152 1870, 3M 9210, and Halyard Fluidshield 46727, which had passing rates of 71%, 100%, 75%,
153 and 80%, respectively. The other models tested had much lower QTFT passing rates across
154 different users with Cardinal Health, Gerson 1730, and Gerson 2130 having passing rates of
155 0%, 10%, and 11%, respectively. These models may work well with face types and sizes not

156 representative in our volunteer population. However, for our studies we defined these last three
157 models as “hard-to-fit” and did not include them in the decontamination experiments.

158 **Decontamination with VHP does not affect the integrity of 3M 1860/3M 1860S, 3M 1870,**
159 **3M 9210, but may reduce the integrity of Halyard Fluidshield 46727.** To evaluate the effect
160 of VHP decontamination on N95 respirator integrity, new unworn N95 respirators were
161 decontaminated consecutively for up to eight cycles. Following each decontamination cycle, a
162 subset was removed for quantitative fit testing. Availability and supply limitations of N95
163 respirators influenced which models were evaluated at each decontamination cycle and only
164 cycles with at least n= 3 were analyzed. Both 3M 1860/3M 1860S and 3M 1870 N95 respirators
165 maintained integrity following up to eight and six cycles of VHP decontamination, respectively
166 (Figure 3A and 3B). There was also no significant difference in the integrity of 3M 9210 following
167 up to seven decontamination cycles (Figure 3C). We observed a clear downward trend in the
168 integrity of Halyard Fluidshield 46727 N95 respirators throughout eight decontamination cycles
169 (Figure 3D). However, due to the limited number of respirators during this critical time we were
170 unable to detect any significant differences in the data. Importantly, we did not notice any
171 defects in the elastic headbands, nor did we observe any corrosion on the metal nosepiece and
172 staples following eight cycles with VHP which has also been validated by others [19]. Our
173 observations suggest that some but not all N95 models are appropriate to include in respirator
174 decontamination and reuse programs and warrant further study.

175 **Decreased integrity of 3M 1870 N95 respirators is observed when the respirator is lightly**
176 **worn and then fit tested by a second user.** Not all N95 models will be compatible with all face
177 types and sizes. Respirators that fail QLFTs are generally discarded, but that does not mean
178 they will not provide protection to a different user; it means that the respirator and face type are
179 incompatible. Instead of letting these respirators go to waste, we decontaminated them with
180 VHP and then investigated the flexibility of their face-sealing capacity by assessing integrity on
181 a second user. These second users had previously passed a QTFT on the model (and size

182 where appropriate) being tested. There was a significant decrease in the integrity of 3M 1870
183 N95 respirators when the respirator was lightly worn, decontaminated for six cycles with VHP,
184 and fit tested by a second user compared to a respirator of the same model and size that had
185 undergone the same number of decontamination cycles but was never previously used (Figure
186 4B). No significant differences were observed in the integrity of 3M 1860/3M 1860S, 3M 9210,
187 and Halyard Fluidshield 46727 N95 respirators when fit tested by a second user following
188 multiple rounds of decontamination (Figure 4 A, C, D). Again, due to the limited supply of N95
189 respirators we were unable to assess the differences in integrity between first user and second
190 user for all cycles and models (Figure S1 A-D).

191 **Discrepancies between qualitative and quantitative fit testing are apparent when**
192 **evaluating Gerson 1730.** We expanded our study to examine the possibility of inconsistencies
193 between QLFT and QTFT results from hard-to-fit N95 models. Using both sweet and bitter
194 QLFT measurements followed by a QTFT, we determined that 5/6 participants who passed at
195 least one qualitative fit test were unable to pass quantitatively when testing the Gerson 1730
196 N95 respirator (Table I). Unfortunately, we were unable to find enough participants able to
197 qualitatively fit either Gerson 2130 or Cardinal Health N95 respirators and therefore they were
198 not included in this study (Table SI). The inconsistency between qualitative and quantitative fit
199 testing results calls to question the reliability of QLFTs for measuring the capacity of N95
200 respirators to protect against aerosol exposure.

201 **DISCUSSION**

202 COVID-19 was officially declared a pandemic on 11th March 2020 and has since resulted
203 in an overburdened healthcare system that is struggling to maintain adequate PPE, especially
204 N95 respirators. Many clinical settings have implemented decontamination and reuse programs
205 in response to these shortages. However, recent evaluations of N95 integrity following
206 decontamination have only assessed a single N95 model, 3M 1860/3M 1860S [12-15], and
207 therefore do not account for the total variety of N95 respirators currently in use. This lack of

208 validation means health care workers could be at an increased risk of receiving inadequate
209 PPE. Thus, in this study we quantitatively evaluated the integrity of multiple N95 models
210 currently in use at UH following decontamination with VHP.

211 From January to May 2020, UH increased qualitative fit testing over tenfold and
212 expanded the models of N95 respirators distributed compared to six years prior. Using unworn
213 N95 respirators, we examined the integrity of these models after decontamination with VHP and
214 found that 3M 1860/3M 1860S, 3M 1870, and 3M 9210 did not exhibit any noticeable decrease
215 of integrity. Although not significant, we did observe a downward trend in the integrity of Halyard
216 Fluidshield 46727 N95 respirators over the course of five decontamination cycles, highlighting
217 the importance of further studies.

218 It is crucial that decontamination and reuse programs are able to rapidly turnaround
219 clean N95 respirators. One potential time saving approach is to return N95 respirators to new
220 users instead of having to sort and return respirators to their initial user. To assess the
221 adaptability of N95 respirators to a new face we quantitatively fit tested lightly worn respirators
222 on a second user following decontamination with VHP. Our results were limited to respirators
223 that were initially only worn for a QLFT and are thus not representative of the wear and tear
224 associated during an extended hospital shift. Despite these limitations, the QTFT values were
225 lower for 3M 1870 N95 respirators when they were lightly worn and fit tested by a second user
226 compared to the other respirator models tested. It is also possible that some respirators may be
227 less tolerant for reuse even by the same person, however we were unable to assess that in this
228 study. Although, others have found a significant association between number of shifts N95
229 respirators were worn by a single user and failed QLFTs [21]. These data bring to light a
230 significant obstacle for decontamination and reuse programs.

231 A major unexpected result in this study was the inability to find many users who passed
232 QTFTs on Gerson 1730, Gerson 2130, and Cardinal Health N95 models, despite these
233 respirators representing 42% of passing QLFTs at UH. We therefore wondered if differences

234 existed between QTFT and QLFT results specifically on these hard-to-fit models. Of the ten
235 participants we recruited for QLFTs, six were able to pass at least one of the tasting challenges
236 when qualitatively fit tested on Gerson 1730. Interestingly, only 1/6 of these participants was
237 able to pass on the Gerson 1730 using a QTFT. This discrepancy between QLFTs and QTFTs
238 may be attributed to taste insensitivity which has been shown to increase false positive fit
239 testing [18,22] and could also be a symptom of COVID-19 infection [23-25]. Furthermore,
240 anecdotal reports have indicated issues with competing taste profiles such as previously eaten
241 foods or disinfectants used to clean the hood that may further complicate QLFT results.
242 Together these observations suggest the administration of QTFTs may be warranted for fit
243 testing these hard-to-fit models and should be used to assess inconsistencies between QLFT
244 on other N95 models.

245 We acknowledge that this study has several limitations. All fit testing methods can have
246 false pass rates of up to 11% [17]. The number of N95 respirators fit tested after each
247 decontamination cycle was restricted by supply availability and resulted in unequal sample sizes
248 between groups. Finally, when assessing the integrity of N95 respirators fit on a second user,
249 the original N95 respirator was not worn during a long shift and therefore may not be
250 representative of all respirators included in decontamination and reuse programs.

251 **CONCLUSIONS**

252 Decontamination and reuse of 3M 1860/3M 1860S, 3M 1870, and 3M 9210 N95 respirators is a
253 potential solution to N95 respirator supply shortages. Further studies must address the
254 downward trends observed in the integrity of Halyard Fluidshield 46727 N95 respirators after
255 decontamination with VHP. Caution should be taken when returning 3M 1870 to a second user
256 following VHP decontamination. Finally, the lack of consistency between QLFT and QTFT
257 results may have far reaching consequences on the type of fit test administered by institutions
258 when determining which respirator is best for protection against aerosolized pathogens.

259 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

260 We would like to thank Dr. Jessica McCormick Ell (National Institutes of Health), Dr. Anthony
261 Gresko (Rutgers University), Guillaume Delmas (Rutgers University), Brian Eggert (Rutgers
262 University), Dr. Mark Einstein (UH), Dr. Debra Chew (Rutgers NJMS), and all of the other
263 members of The Center for COVID-19 Response and Pandemic Preparedness team who
264 helped get the N95 decontamination and reuse program up and running. We would like to thank
265 Safia Amatullah (UH), Lee Clark (UH), and Jo Ellen Harris (UH) for coordinating N95 respirator
266 delivery to the decontamination site. We would also like to thank Dr. Pradeep Kumar (Rutgers
267 NJMS), Dr. Padmapriya Banada (Rutgers NJMS), Dr. Sukalyani Banik (Rutgers NJMS), Heta
268 Parmar (Rutgers NJMS), Skarleth Moran (Rutgers NJMS), Shraddha Suryavanshi (Rutgers
269 NJMS), and Kaheerman Saibire (Rutgers NJMS) for volunteering to participate in our fit testing
270 studies.

271 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT**

272 None declared.

273 **FUNDING SUPPORT**

274 This work was supported by University Hospital, Newark NJ; and the National Institute of Allergy
275 and Infectious Diseases of the National Institutes of Health [grant number T32AI125185].

276 **REFERENCES**

277 [1] Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real
278 time. *The Lancet Infectious diseases* 2020; **20**: 533-4.

279 [2] Shim E, Tariq A, Choi W, Lee Y, Chowell G. Transmission potential and severity of COVID-
280 19 in South Korea. *International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the*
281 *International Society for Infectious Diseases* 2020; **93**: 339-44.

282 [3] Wang D, Hu B, Hu C *et al.* Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019
283 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *Jama* 2020; **323**: 1061-9.

- 284 [4] Martin C, Montesinos I, Dauby N *et al.* Dynamic of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positivity and
285 seroprevalence among high-risk health care workers and hospital staff. *Journal of Hospital*
286 *Infection* 2020; doi 10.1016/j.jhin.2020.06.028.
- 287 [5] Cheung JC, Ho LT, Cheng JV, Cham EYK, Lam KN. Staff safety during emergency airway
288 management for COVID-19 in Hong Kong. *Lancet Respir Med* 2020; **8**: e19.
- 289 [6] Tran K, Cimon K, Severn M, Pessoa-Silva CL, Conly J. Aerosol generating procedures and
290 risk of transmission of acute respiratory infections to healthcare workers: a systematic review.
291 *PloS one* 2012; **7**: e35797.
- 292 [7] The Lancet. COVID-19: protecting health-care workers. *Lancet* 2020; **395**: 922.
- 293 [8] O'Sullivan ED. PPE guidance for covid-19: be honest about resource shortages. *Bmj* 2020;
294 **369**: m1507.
- 295 [9] World Health Organization. Rational use of personal protective equipment (PPE) for
296 coronavirus disease (COVID-19): interim guidance, 19 March 2020. 2020.
- 297 [10] Kamerow D. Covid-19: the crisis of personal protective equipment in the US. *BMJ (Clinical*
298 *research ed)* 2020; **369**: m1367.
- 299 [11] Kapust PJ. Enforcement Guidance on Decontamination of Filtering Facepiece Respirators in
300 Healthcare During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic. 2020. OSHA.
301 [https://www.osha.gov/memos/2020-04-24/enforcement-guidance-decontamination-filtering-](https://www.osha.gov/memos/2020-04-24/enforcement-guidance-decontamination-filtering-facepiece-respirators-healthcare)
302 [facepiece-respirators-healthcare](https://www.osha.gov/memos/2020-04-24/enforcement-guidance-decontamination-filtering-facepiece-respirators-healthcare).
- 303 [12] Schwartz A, Stiegel M, Greeson N *et al.* Decontamination and Reuse of N95 Respirators
304 with Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor to Address Worldwide Personal Protective Equipment Shortages
305 During the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Pandemic. *Applied Biosafety* 2020; **25**: 67-70.
- 306 [13] Li DF, Cadnum JL, Redmond SN, Jones LD, Donskey CJ. It's not the heat, it's the humidity:
307 Effectiveness of a rice cooker-steamer for decontamination of cloth and surgical face masks and
308 N95 respirators. *American journal of infection control* 2020; **48**: 854-5.

- 309 [14] Xiang Y, Song Q, Gu W. Decontamination of Surgical Face Masks and N95 Respirators by
310 Dry Heat Pasteurization for One Hour at 70°C. American journal of infection control 2020; doi
311 10.1016/j.ajic.2020.05.026.
- 312 [15] Fisher EM, Shaffer RE. A method to determine the available UV-C dose for the
313 decontamination of filtering facepiece respirators. J Appl Microbiol 2011; **110**: 287-95.
- 314 [16] United States Department of Labor. Occupational Safety and Health Standards Personal
315 Protection Equipment: Respiratory Protection. 1998; **1910.134**.
- 316 [17] Coffey CC, Lawrence RB, Zhuang Z, Campbell DL, Jensen PA, Myers WR. Comparison of
317 five methods for fit-testing N95 filtering-facepiece respirators. Applied occupational and
318 environmental hygiene 2002; **17**: 723-30.
- 319 [18] McKay RT, Davies E. Capability of respirator wearers to detect aerosolized qualitative fit
320 test agents (sweetener and Bitrex) with known fixed leaks. Applied occupational and
321 environmental hygiene 2000; **15**: 479-84.
- 322 [19] Batelle. Federal Drug Administration. Final Report for the Bioquell Hydrogen Peroxide
323 Vapor (HPV) Decontamination for Reuse of N95 Respirators. 2016: 2-46.
324 <https://www.fda.gov/media/136386/download>.
- 325 [20] Viscusi DJ, Bergman MS, Eimer BC, Shaffer RE. Evaluation of five decontamination
326 methods for filtering facepiece respirators. The Annals of occupational hygiene 2009; **53**: 815-
327 27.
- 328 [21] Degesys NF, Wang RC, Kwan E, Fahimi J, Noble JA, Raven MC. Correlation Between N95
329 Extended Use and Reuse and Fit Failure in an Emergency Department. Jama 2020; doi
330 10.1001/jama.2020.9843.
- 331 [22] Coffey CC, Lawrence RB, Campbell DL, Zhuang Z, Calvert CA, Jensen PA. Fitting
332 characteristics of eighteen N95 filtering-facepiece respirators. Journal of occupational and
333 environmental hygiene 2004; **1**: 262-71.

334 [23] Xydakis MS, Dehgani-Mobaraki P, Holbrook EH *et al.* Smell and taste dysfunction in
335 patients with COVID-19. *The Lancet Infectious diseases* 2020; doi 10.1016/s1473-
336 3099(20)30293-0.

337 [24] Yan CH, Faraji F, Prajapati DP, Boone CE, DeConde AS. Association of chemosensory
338 dysfunction and COVID-19 in patients presenting with influenza-like symptoms. *International*
339 *forum of allergy & rhinology* 2020; doi 10.1002/alr.22579.

340 [25] Gautier JF, Ravussin Y. A New Symptom of COVID-19: Loss of Taste and Smell. *Obesity*
341 (Silver Spring, Md) 2020; **28**: 848.

342 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

343 **Figure 1: Fit test frequency and distribution of N95 respirators by UH. A)** The frequency of
344 QLFTs increased tenfold and the **B)** diversity of N95 models expanded since the beginning of
345 the COVID-19 pandemic.


346 **Figure 2: Quantitative fit testing of N95 respirators commonly used at UH between**
347 **January and May 2020.** These data defined quantitatively hard-to-fit N95 models: Cardinal
348 Health, Gerson 1730, and Gerson 2130. A fit factor ≥ 100 was considered a pass (dotted line).
349 Bars represent the median. 3M 1860/3M 1806S n=7, 3M 1870 n=4, 3M 9210 n=4, Halyard
350 Fluidshield 46727 n=5, Cardinal Health n=10, Gerson 1730 n=10, Gerson 2130 n=9.

351 **Figure 3: Decontamination with VHP does not affect the integrity of A) 3M 1860, B) 3M**
352 **1870, C) 3M 9210, but potentially reduces the integrity of D) Halyard Fluidshield 46727.** No
353 significant differences were observed between decontamination cycles for any model when
354 analyzed using a one tailed Kruskal-Wallis test. However, there was an observable downward
355 trend in the integrity of Halyard Fluidshield 46727 throughout eight cycles of decontamination. A
356 passing value was set as a fit factor ≥ 100 (dotted line). Only decontamination cycles with at
357 least n= 3 were considered for analysis. Bars represent the median.


358 **Figure 4: Comparison of the integrity of N95 respirators that were not previously worn to**
359 **N95 respirators that were lightly worn.** Fit test data from our earlier decontamination studies





360 on new N95 respirators (closed circles) were used to evaluate the effect of light wear (open
361 circles) on N95 respirator integrity following VHP decontamination. **A)** A nonsignificant
362 downward trend in the integrity of 3M 1860/3M 1860S N95 respirators is observed following five,
363 six, and seven decontamination cycles when the N95 respirator was previously worn. **B)** 3M
364 1870s that were lightly worn, decontaminated for six cycles, and fit on a new second user had a
365 significant decrease in integrity compared to 3M 1870 N95 respirators that were
366 decontaminated for six cycles but not previously worn. No significant trends were found in the
367 integrity of **C)** 3M 9210 and **D)** Halyard Fluidshield 46727 when the N95 respirator was
368 previously worn. Only decontamination cycles with at least $n=3$ were considered for analysis. A
369 passing value was set as a fit factor ≥ 100 (dotted line). Bars represent the median. A one tailed
370 Mann-Whitney U test was used for statistical analysis (*, $p=0.025$).





371 **Table I: Frequent inconsistencies between QLFT and QTFT results were uncovered when**
372 **fit tested on Gerson 1730 N95 respirators. P = pass, F= fail**



B



A**B****C****D**



Gerson 1730

Qualitative

Quantitative

User

Sweet

Bitter

1

P

P

F

2

P

P

F

3

F

P

F

4

P

F

F

5

F

P

F

6

P

P

P

7

P

F

F

8

F

F

F

9

F

P

F

10

P

P

P