

Supplementary Information for:
**Filtration performance of masks and face coverings and the reusability of cotton masks
after repeated washing and drying cycles**

Sumit Sankhyan¹, Karen N. Heinselman², Peter N. Ciesielski², Teresa Barnes², Michael E.
Himmel², Hannah Teed³, Sameer Patel^{1¶}, Marina E. Vance^{1,3*}.

¹Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Colorado Boulder.

²Renewable Resources and Enabling Sciences Center, NREL.

³Environmental Engineering Program, University of Colorado Boulder.

¶: Now at Department of Civil Engineering, IIT Gandhinagar, Gandhinagar, GJ 382355, IN

*To whom correspondence should be addressed.

Tel: +1-303-735-4567

E-mail address: marina.vance@colorado.edu

Table of Contents:

Table S1: Filtration efficiency results (average \pm standard deviation) in terms of total PM_{2.5} number and mass, and in terms of PM mass at 300 nm for all samples evaluated in this study along with the pressure drop results. These filtration efficiency results were obtained using Experimental Setup 1.

Fig. S1. Different samples that were used in this study are shown from top right to bottom in clockwise direction: N95 respirator, KN95 respirator, Surgical mask (SM), wash/dry sample coupon, 2-ply bandana and Cloth mask (CM).

Fig. S2. Wash/dry sample coupon fabrication steps. (a) 8" squares are cut from the two different fabrics, and one of each color are placed right sides together (b) a 1/4" seam is stitched around the edges, leaving a ~2" gap for flipping inside out (c) corners are clipped to remove bulk (d) sample coupon is flipped inside out and pressed into shape (e) topstitching around the outside edge to enclose raw edges and reinforce seams.

Fig. S3. Schematic of Setup 1 used for characterizing the filtration efficiency in the 60- 450 nm particle size range. The figure is not to scale with the actual setup. Not shown in schematic: The aerosol stream passed through a diffusion dryer and an X-ray neutralizer before being injected into the testing chamber.

Fig. S4. Setup 2 used for characterizing the filtration efficiency in the 542 nm- 4 μm particle size range.

Fig. S5. Temporal evolution of aerosol size distributions inside the chamber (shown via series of different colored lines) during the testing duration for Setup 1.

Fig. S6. Temporal evolution of aerosol size distributions inside the chamber (shown via series of different colored lines) during the testing duration for Setup 2.

Fig. S7. Comparison between the experimental results and the results from a particle transmission model based on classical filtration theory for all six mask combinations. Root mean squared error (RMSE) between experimental and theoretical curves is also shown for each mask combination.

Fig. S8. Filter quality factor values (QF) as a function of different wash/dry cycles.

Table S1: Filtration efficiency results (average \pm standard deviation) in terms of total PM_{2.5} number and mass, and in terms of PM mass at 300 nm for all samples evaluated in this study along with the pressure drop results. These filtration efficiency results were obtained using Experimental Setup 1.

Mask	PM_{2.5} number efficiency	PM_{2.5} mass efficiency	Efficiency at 300 nm (mass)	Pressure drop (Pa)^a
N95 A	96% \pm 1%	95% \pm 1%	95% \pm 1%	182 \pm 2
N95 B	98% \pm 0%	97% \pm 1%	98% \pm 1%	169 \pm 1
N95 C	99% \pm 0%	99% \pm 0%	99% \pm 0%	127 \pm 3
KN95 A	92% \pm 2%	93% \pm 3%	93% \pm 3%	166 \pm 5
KN95 B	92% \pm 1%	92% \pm 2%	92% \pm 2%	182 \pm 2
KN95 C	93% \pm 1%	93% \pm 1%	93% \pm 2%	189 \pm 5
KN95 D	89% \pm 2%	85% \pm 2%	83% \pm 3%	176 \pm 1
KN95 E	97% \pm 0%	98% \pm 0%	98% \pm 0%	168 \pm 6
KN95 F	93% \pm 1%	94% \pm 1%	93% \pm 1%	178 \pm 5
SM A	87% \pm 0%	89% \pm 0%	88% \pm 0%	45 \pm 3
SM B	79% \pm 1%	49% \pm 0%	62% \pm 2%	49 \pm 6
SM C	71% \pm 1%	49% \pm 0%	50% \pm 2%	55 \pm 6
SM D	71% \pm 1%	44% \pm 1%	42% \pm 6%	39 \pm 7
CM A	42% \pm 3%	16% \pm 1%	18% \pm 4%	11 \pm 6
CM B	36% \pm 2%	14% \pm 1%	16% \pm 2%	52 \pm 3
CM C	53% \pm 2%	23% \pm 1%	23% \pm 4%	19 \pm 6
2-ply bandana	27% \pm 2%	9% \pm 1%	9% \pm 4%	33 \pm 6
SM A(x2)	88% \pm 0%	87% \pm 0%	86% \pm 1%	93 \pm 6
SM B(x2)	86% \pm 0%	80% \pm 0%	81% \pm 2%	100 \pm 9
SM C(x2)	83% \pm 0%	72% \pm 1%	70% \pm 2%	95 \pm 3
CM A + SM A	91% \pm 0%	90% \pm 0%	91% \pm 2%	68 \pm 8
CM A + SM B	85% \pm 1%	72% \pm 1%	68% \pm 2%	72 \pm 2
CM A + SM C	82% \pm 1%	61% \pm 1%	64% \pm 2%	66 \pm 4

a: NIOSH threshold limit for N95 respirators is 343 Pa.



Fig. S1. Different samples that were used in this study are shown from top right to bottom in clockwise direction: N95 respirator, KN95 respirator, Surgical mask (SM), wash/dry sample coupon, 2-ply bandana and Cloth mask (CM).




Fig. S2. Wash/dry sample coupon fabrication steps. (a) 8" squares are cut from the two different fabrics, and one of each color are placed right sides together (b) a 1/4" seam is stitched around the edges, leaving a ~2" gap for flipping inside out (c) corners are clipped to remove bulk (d) sample coupon is flipped inside out and pressed into shape (e) topstitching around the outside edge to enclose raw edges and reinforce seams.




Fig. S3. Schematic of Setup 1 used for characterizing the filtration efficiency in the 60- 450 nm particle size range. The figure is not to scale with the actual setup. Not shown in schematic: The aerosol stream passed through a diffusion dryer and an X-ray neutralizer before being injected into the testing chamber.




Fig. S4. Setup 2 used for characterizing the filtration efficiency in the 542 nm- 4 μm particle size range.




Fig. S5. Temporal evolution of aerosol size distributions inside the chamber (shown via series of different colored lines) during the testing duration for Setup 1.




Fig. S6. Temporal evolution of aerosol size distributions inside the chamber (shown via series of different colored lines) during the testing duration for Setup 2.




Fig. S7. Comparison between the experimental results and the results from a particle transmission model based on classical filtration theory for all six mask combinations. Root mean squared error (RMSE) between experimental and theoretical curves is also shown for each mask combination.




Fig. S8. Filter quality factor values (QF) as a function of different wash/dry cycles.