1	
2	
3	
4	Using surgical wrapping material for the fabrication of
5	respirator masks
6	
7	
8 9 10	Johanna H Meijer ^{1&*} , Joric Oude Vrielink ^{2&}
10 11 12	¹ Department of Cell and Chemical Biology, Leiden University Medical Centre, Leiden, The Netherlands
13 14 15 16 17	² Department of Medical Technology, Leiden University Medical Centre, Leiden, The Netherlands
18 19 20 21	*Corresponding author E-mail: J.H.Meijer@LUMC.nl
22	^{&} The authors contributed equally to this work.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract 1

2

3 Given the current shortage of respirator masks and the resulting lack of personal 4 protective equipment for use by clinical staff, we examined bottom-up solutions that would 5 allow hospitals to fabricate respirator masks that: (i) meet requirements in terms of filtering 6 capacities, (ii) are easy to produce rapidly and locally, and (iii) can be constructed using 7 materials commonly available in hospitals worldwide. We found that Halyard H300 material 8 used for wrapping of surgical instruments and routinely available in hospitals, met these 9 criteria. Specifically, three layers of material achieved a filter efficiency of 94%, 99%, and 10 100% for 0.3 μ m, 0.5 μ m, and 3.0 μ m particles, respectively; importantly, these values are 11 close to the efficiency provided by FFP2 and N95 masks. After re-sterilization up to 5 times, 12 the filter's efficiency remains sufficiently high for use as an FFP1 respirator mask. Finally, 13 using only one layer of the material satisfies the criteria for use as a 'surgical mask'. This 14 material can therefore be used to help protect hospital staff and other healthcare 15 professionals who require access to suitable masks but lack commercially available 16 solutions.

17

Introduction 18

19

20 The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, which began in late 2019 and rapidly spread throughout 21 the world in early 2020, has led to a severe shortage of basic personal protective equipment 22 for people working in high-risk occupations, including hospitals and extended care homes. 23 Because SARS-CoV-2 can be transmitted via aerosolized droplets [1], the demand for high-24 quality, well tested respirator masks has increased dramatically. In an attempt to help 25 provide access to personal protective equipment against SARS-CoV-2, particularly in 26 locations currently experiencing a shortage of masks [2], we investigated whether 27 sterilization wrapping material is suitability for use in the production of FFP2 masks. We 28 chose to use this material because of its filter properties, and its current availability in most 29 hospitals, and the near-global sales market. The wrapping material Halyard Quickcheck 30 H300 (manufactured by Owens & Minor) is commonly used to wrap surgical instruments for 31 sterilization with steam or ethylene oxide gas; after sterilization, the material provides a 32 sterile barrier against pathogens. Thus, the filter properties of this wrapping material are 33 similar to the materials used in respirator masks. Moreover, the surgical wrapping material 34 is composed of polypropylene, a material commonly used in air filters. Although sterilization 35 wrapping has previously been suggested as an alternative material for the local production 36 of respirator masks [3][4][5], it has not been tested. 37

38 A series of industrial standards are currently used to classify the filter efficiency of 39 respirators. The European Norm (EN) 149 standard [6] classifies respirators using FFP 40 (Filtering Facemask against Particles) values, while World Health Organisation (WHO) 41 guidelines require that healthcare workers—particularly those working under aerosol-42 generating conditions—wear a mask that provides at least FFP2 protection or equivalent [7], 43 with FFP2 corresponding to a filter efficiency of at least 94%. Providing a filter efficiency of 44 at least 95%, similar standards are used for N95 and NK95 masks, corresponding to 45 regulation NIOSH 42 CFR 84 in the US and norm GB2626-2006 in China, respectively. For

46 respirator masks, the material's efficiency at filtering particles 0.3 µm in size is considered 47 the most relevant, as particles of this size are the extremely difficult to filter out [8].

48

49 In addition to the above-mentioned EN 149 norm, several commercially available 50 respirators are also classified using the EN 14683 standard [9]; the equivalent classification in the US is the ASTM F2100 standard. This standard is specific to masks used for medical 51 52 purposes, primarily to protect patients from contamination, for example during surgery. In 53 light of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, the WHO now recommends the use of surgical masks by 54 patients who are potentially infected with the virus and hospital staff who work with these 55 patients [10]. As an alternative to surgical masks, FFP1 respirators have also been 56 suggested; however, although FFP1 respirator masks provide better particle protection than 57 surgical masks, they are less splash-resistant than surgical masks [12]. 58 59 Here, we investigated whether Halyard wrapping material can be used to create masks in 60 order to help protect healthcare workers under various conditions. We used standardized 61 equipment to measure the transmission of various particle sizes, and we also measured 62 splash resistance. Finally, we used standard sterilization procedures in order to investigate 63 whether the material can be re-used while still providing sufficient protection. Moreover, 64 we developed a prototype for a complete, functional respirator mask, with the aim of 65 facilitating its rapid on-site fabrication. Importantly, we also identified additional materials 66 that allow for the production of high quantities of respirator masks using basic workshop 67 instruments and found that the masks can be produced in at the relatively rapid rate of under 10 minutes per mask.

68 69

Methods 70

71

72 The filter properties of the surgical isolation and wrapping material Halyard 73 Quickcheck H300 (Owens & Minor, Inc.) was tested using a Solair 3100 particle counter 74 (Lighthouse Worldwide Solutions Benelux B.V.) as shown in Figure 1. The flow rate was set 75 at 1.0 CFM (cubic feet per minute)cfm, which is well above (4x) normal breathing, and the 76 filter efficiency of the material for 0.3 μ m, 0.5 μ m, and 3.0 μ m particles was measured. The 77 filter efficiency (FE) for a given particle size was determined using the particles measured 78 after filtering (P_f) with a background measurement performed without the filter (P_{BG}) , using 79 the following equation: $FE = (P_{BG} - P_f)/P_{BG}$.

80

In addition, the pressure differential was measured over the sample to provide a 81 82 measure of breathing resistance. The surface of the material through which the air passes is 83 a circle with 33 mm diameter; this surface area was used to normalize the measured pressure to Pa/cm². For comparison, we also measured the differential pressure of 84 85 commercially available FFP2 respirators and surgical masks.

86

87 Splash resistance was measured using a water column pressure test (Figure 1). In 88 brief, the water column is filled gradually, increasing the pressure at the sample, and the 89 height of water in the column withheld by the material sample is defined as the sample's 90 splash resistance.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.10.20060632; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

91

92 Figure 1. Schematic diagrams depicting the tests used to measure filter efficiency (top left), splash resistance 93 (top right), and breathability of the materials examined in this study.

94 95 We tested 1, 2, and 3 layers of Halyard Quick Check H300 material and performed 96 each measurement four times. All tests were then repeated following each subsequent 97 round of steam sterilization (5 min at 121 degrees Celsius under 2.0 atm of pressure). In addition, these tests were repeated with the material reversed and after the mask was worn 98 99 for 20 min. Finally, three commercially available masks were tested as a control and for

100 comparison with the custom-made masks: (1) Surgical Mask, Henan Gore Medical

101 Instruments Co. Ltd (2) Disposable FFP2 mask, (3) 3820 FFP2 NR D, 3M.

102

This study did not involve any human subjects, and therefore was exempt from 103 104 ethical approval. The data from the Particle Counter was downloaded and stored into a .xslx 105 worksheet. The data of the differential pressure test and the water column test was 106 manually inserted in separate .xlsx files. The data analyses was performed using Microsoft 107 Excel, including the independent t-tests required for statistical analysis.

108

Results 109

110

111 Figure 2 shows the results obtained using various configurations of wrapping 112 material. Three layers of non-sterilized wrapping material provided mean (±SD) filter 113 efficiency values of 93.84±0.37%, 99.45±0.08%, and 99.99±0.01% for 0.3 μm, 0.5 μm, and 114 3.0 µm particles, respectively, satisfying the criterion for an FFP2 respirator mask (summary 115 results are provided in Table 1, and the complete results are provided in the Supplemental 116 Data). Two layers resulted in 87.68±0.43%, 98.28±0.10%, and 99.98±0.00%, respectively, 117 was satisfies the criteria for an FFP1 respirator mask. Importantly, the triple-layer material's efficiency at filtering 0.5 µm and 3.0 µm particles remained above the FFP2 standards even 118 119 after five rounds of sterilization cycles; however, the filter efficiency for 0.3 µm particles 120 decreased below the requirements for an FFP2 mask, but was still sufficient for use an as 121 FFP1 mask.

122

123 Figure 2. Summary of the filter efficiency of the indicated materials, including five rounds of sterilization at 124 121 degrees Celsius for the triple-layer material. For comparison, we also included a surgical mask and two 125 types of FFP2 mask. 126

127 Table 1 shows the filtering efficiencies for the wrapping material. Based on the tests 128 with the double layer material it is shown that the filter efficiency did not significantly 129 change when reversing the material or after wearing the respirator mask for 20 min (p =130 0.057 for 0.3 μ m particle size). After sterilization of the wrapping material the filter efficiency 131 at the 0.3 µm decreased significantly after 1 round of sterilization for single, double and 132 triple layers of materials (p = 0.019, p = 0.004 and p = 0.000, respectively). The filter 133 efficiency for 3.0µm particles in triple layer material significantly changed after 4 134 sterilization cycles (p = 0.049).

135

136 Table 1. Summary of the filter efficiency of the Quickcheck H300 material and commercially available masks, 137 for the indicated particle sizes.

138

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.10.20060632; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Halyard Quickcheck H300	0,3 μm	0,5 μm	3,0 µm
White layer only*	62.57±2.44%	80.30±2.43%	96.17±0.39%
Blue layer only*	62.84±0.79%	79.52±0.81%	96.44±0.39%
Single Layer	70.08±0.48%	89.68±0.70%	99.74±0.13%
Single Layer, 1x Sterilized	66.37±0.31%	87.19±0.07%	99.57±0.23%
Double Layer	87.68±0.43%	98.28±0.10%	99.98±0.00%
Double Layer, reversed	88.78±0.72%	98.35±0.22%	99.99±0.01%
Double Layer, after 20 min use	90.93±0.05%	99.07±0.00%	100.00±0.00%
Double Layer, 1x sterilized	80.39±0.33%	95.79±0.17%	99.99±0.01%
Triple Layer	93.84±0.37%	99.45±0.08%	99.99±0.01%
Triple Layer, 1x sterilized	85.11±2.49%	98.44±0.28%	99.97±0.03%
Triple Layer, 2x sterilized	87.52±1.25%	99.38±0.12%	99.96±0.02%
Triple Layer, 3x sterilized	82.58±0.87%	98.87±0.12%	99.97±0.03%
Triple Layer, 4x sterilized	85.81±0.47%	99.23±0.05%	99.94±0.03%
Triple Layer, 5x sterilized	83.48±0.96%	99.00±0.11%	99.97±0.02%

Commercially available masks and respirators

Surgical Mask	54.52±2.77%	88.61±1.13%	98.92±0.64%
Disposable Face Mask FFP2	94.08±0.42%	99.57±0.04%	100.00±0.00%
3M 8320 FFP2 NR D Respirator	97.44±1.33%	99.75±0.12%	99.94±0.08%

* Note that each layer of this material comes as a composite of a blue and white sheet.

139

As shown in Figure 3 (supplementary data in S2 Data), the pressure differential across the wrapping material, which provides an approximation of the material's breathability, increases with each additional layer). No significant difference in pressure differential was observed after the sterilization ($p_1 = 0.099$, $p_2 = 0.540$, $p_3 = 0.327$, $p_4 =$ 0.961, $p_5 = 0.577$ for the 1-5 sterilization cycles compared to unsterilized material, respectively).

146

Figure 3. The differential pressure over the different layers of materials, including after different rounds of
sterilization. As a comparison the differential pressure is compared to commercially available surgical masks
and disposable FFP2 respirators.

Figure 4 summarizes the results of the water column test, which provides an approximate measure of the materials' splash resistance (Supplementary data in S3 Data). With two and three layers of wrapping material, the mean column pressure was 92 and 105 cm H₂O, respectively; similar results were obtained when the material was reversed.

155

157

156 Figure 4. Summary of the results of the water column test.

A single layer of non-sterilized wrapping material provided similar or better results compared to a surgical mask in terms of filter efficiency (p = 0.001), and splash resistance (p = 0.002). On the other hand, the breathability of the surgical mask was better than the wrapping material (p = 0.000, one-tailed independent t-test).

163 As a comparison Halyard Quickcheck H500, which is used for wrapping heavier instrumentation, was tested (supplementary S4 data). The material shows improved splash 164 165 resistance and filter efficiencies, also for 0.3 µm, however, the material has considerable 166 higher breathing resistance than the H300 material.

Discussion 168

169

167

170 Here, we report that the Halyard Quickcheck H300 surgical wrapping material, which 171 is commonly available in most hospitals for use in sterilizing surgical instruments, provides 172 high filtration efficiency for all three particle sizes measured. Specifically, three layers of the 173 material filtered approximately 94% of 0.3 µm particles, which is similar to the requirements 174 established for N95 (95%) and FFP2 (94%) respirator masks [13][14]. In addition, the three-175 layer provided a filter efficiency of 99.5% and 100% for 0.5 and 3.0 μ m particles, 176 respectively. Moreover, we found that the wrapping material provides high splash 177 resistance; although this is not a requirement for respirator masks, this property helps 178 protect against transmission due to coughing and sneezing. After several sterilization

- 179 rounds, the masks were suitable for use as FFP1 respirators.
- 180

181 In addition, we found that a single layer of wrapping material is suitable for use as a 182 high-quality alternative for splash resistant surgical mask. Of note, our testing method differed from the method recommended by EN 14683; specifically, we did not test bacterial 183 184 pathogens. The filter efficiency of surgical masks is determined specifically based on the 185 ability to filter the *Staphylococcus aureus* bacterium, which has a diameter of 0.5-1.5 μm 186 [12][15]. Although we measured particles, rather than bacteria, we found that even a single 187 layer of H300 provides higher filter efficiencies and splash resistance.

188

189 The precise particle size that is most critical in the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 is 190 currently under debate and subject to change as new information becomes available. The 191 current prevailing view is that somewhat larger-diameter aerosols play a major role in the 192 virus' transmission but that also small aerosols or particles can carry the virus over long 193 distances [16]. These aerosols can reach the ACE-2 receptor proteins abundantly expressed 194 in the upper respiratory tract [17][18], and coughing and sneezing are believed to be one of 195 the major routes of transmission [19]. In this respect, the high splash resistance of H300 196 material seems particularly important, and although this property is not an official 197 requirement of N95 and FFP masks, we believe that this will support its protective function. 198

199 The breathability of the H300 material decreased with each layer added. We found 200 that three layers of material have high breathing resistance, above the maximum standard 201 for surgical masks, which is provided as a measure per surface area. Notably, breathability 202 for N95 or FFP2 respirator masks is not specified for the material but for the entire mask, 203 making it dependent on the design and surface area.

204

205 We constructed a complete respiratory mask in order to facilitate in-house 206 production. We identified a basic set of conventional materials (aluminum, neoprene 207 rubber, and elastic material) with suitable specifications (see Figure 5), recognizing that 208 many other designs will also work [3][4][5]. Most hospitals—even in rural areas—have a 209 basic workshop. The only key requirement for our design is a machine to cut aluminum and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.10.20060632; this version posted June 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- 210 elastic strips out of larger sheets. The model that we propose is relatively easy to make, and we intentionally designed the mask so that the wearer can breathe through the entire 211
- surface of the mask, increasing breathability and thereby comfort. 212
- 213

224

214 Figure 5. A possible design for fabricating a respirator mask with the sterile isolation material. (A) The layers 215 of the Halyard sterile isolation material are attached by a stitch line on both longitudinal lengths of the 216 sheets. The sheet is folded to provide alignment with the face, and thereby ensure the respirator mask has 217 an adequate fit when worn. The elastics (Resistance Band, Matchu Sport BV) is laser-cut to a width of 13/32 218 inch (10mm), and a length of 7 7/8 inch (200mm) and attached at the inside of the respirator mask. A single 219 stitch line at the bottom ensures that the surface of the respirator mask stays separated from the mouth 220 and allows to adjust the size of the respirator mask for -and by- anybody. (B) For the nose clip a 0.5mm thick 221 aluminum strips (AI 99.5%, 1050A) is used, cut to a length of 3 1/2 inch (90mm) and a width of 5/32 inch 222 (4mm). A neoprene strip with adhesive is used to hold the noseclip in place, and adhered to the inner-top 223 side of the respirator mask. The fit of the mask was tested using an FT-30 Fit Test from 3M.

- 225 In other studies, the suitability of alternative materials for use as respirator masks 226 has been investigated. For instance, a regular tea cloth provides some protection, but 227 remains a factor 50 below the FFP2 requirements [20]. A recent study analyzed the filtering 228 efficiencies of various conventional fabrics to assess possible materials for the SARS-CoV-2 229 pandemic [21]. The results from this study contributed to understand the efficiencies for 230 alternative materials for home-made masks and showed that widely available materials 231 such as cotton and chiffon displayed filtering efficiencies above 95%, for larger, but not for 232 smaller particles. Our study was specifically aimed to allow for solutions in hospitals and 233 other critical environments and provide a solution in case of a limited supply of high quality 234 protective respirator masks.
- 235

Acknowledgements 236

237 The authors would like to thank the Development Department of the LUMC, Huybert 238 van der Stadt (for photography), and André van der Zee (for assistance on measurements). 239 We thank G.D. Block (UCLA), J.S. Takahashi (Southwestern University), and G.A. Fitzgerald 240 (University of Pennsylvania) for providing general comments regarding the paper. We are 241 particularly grateful to Nuri Cano (tailor) for pointing us in the right direction, and without 242 whom this work had not been undertaken.

243

References 244

- 245
- Morawska, L., & Cao, J. (2020). Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The world [1] should face the reality. Environment International, 105730.
- [2] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Strategies for Optimizing the Supply of Facemasks. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/facemasks.html. Published March 17, 2020. Accessed April 4, 2020.
- [3] West Virginia University. WVU engineers, designers partner tot test material for surgical masks. https://wvutoday.wvu.edu/stories/2020/04/17/wvu-engineersdesigners-partner-to-test-materials-for-surgical-masks. Published April 17, 2020. Accessed May 28, 2020.

- [4] Medium. A simple method for making surgical masks from operating room sterilization wrap. https://medium.com/@GundleMD/a-simple-method-for-makingsurgical-masks-from-operating-room-sterilization-wrap-6aaaf5e6b041. Published March 23, 2020. Accessed May 28, 2020
- [5] University of Floria, Department of Anesthesiology. Mask Alternative. https://anest.ufl.edu/clinical-divisions/mask-alternative/. Published April 14,2020. Accessed 28 May, 2020.
- [6] European Standard EN 149+A1:2009. Respiratory protective devices Filtering half masks to protect against particles - Requirements, testing, marking. May 2009.
- [7] World Health Organization. "Infection prevention and control during health care when novel coronavirus (nCoV) infection is suspected Interim guidance, 19 March 2020." (2020).
- [8] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. N95 Respirators and Surgical Masks. https://blogs.cdc.gov/niosh-science-blog/2009/10/14/n95/. Published October 14, 2009. Accessed April 4, 2020.
- [9] European Standard EN 14683:2019. Medical face masks Requirements and test methods. August 2019.
- [10] World Health Organization. Advice on the use of masks in the context of COVID-19: interim guidance, 6 April 2020. No. WHO/2019-nCov/IPC Masks/2020.3. World Health Organization, 2020.
- [12] World Health Organization. Rational use of personal protective equipment for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) and considerations during severe shortages: interim guidance, 6 April 2020. No. WHO/2019-nCov/IPC PPE use/2020.3. World Health Organization, 2020.
- [13] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 42 CFR Part 84 Respiratory Protective Devices. https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/topics/respirators/pt84abs2.html. Published March 4, 1997. Accessed April 4, 2020.
- [14] European Standard EN 149+A1:2009. Respiratory protective devices Filtering half masks to protect against particles - Requirements, testing, marking. May 2009.
- [15] Harris, Llinos G., S. J. Foster, and Robert G. Richards. "An introduction to Staphylococcus aureus, and techniques for identifying and quantifying S. aureus adhesins in relation to adhesion to biomaterials: review." Eur Cell Mater 4.3 (2002): 39-60.
- [16] Prather, Kimberly A., et al. "Reducing transmission of SARS-COV-2" Science (2020)
- [17] Lan, Jun, et al. "Structure of the SARS-CoV-2 spike receptor-binding domain bound to the ACE2 receptor." Nature (2020): 1-6.
- [18] Walls, Alexandra C., et al. "Structure, function, and antigenicity of the SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein." Cell (2020).
- [19] Morawska, Lidia, and Junji Cao. "Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The world should face the reality." Environment International (2020): 105730.

- [20] van der Sande, Marianne, Peter Teunis, and Rob Sabel. "Professional and home-made face masks reduce exposure to respiratory infections among the general population." PLoS One 3.7 (2008).
- [21] Konda, Abhiteja, et al. "Aerosol filtration efficiency of common fabrics used in respiratory cloth masks." ACS nano (2020).

246



🗖 0,3 μm 🛛 0,5 μm 🖾 3,0 μm



Filter Efficiency [%]







