

1 **Assessing the quality of nontraditional N95 filtering face-piece respirators available during the**  
2 **COVID-19 pandemic**

3 Deborah Plana<sup>1,2,3\*</sup>, Enze Tian<sup>1,4,5\*</sup>, Avilash K. Cramer<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Helen Yang<sup>1,6\*</sup>, Mary M. Carmack<sup>1,6,7</sup>, Michael  
4 S. Sinha<sup>1,6</sup>, Florence T. Bourgeois<sup>1,6,7</sup>, Sherry H. Yu<sup>1,8</sup>, Peter Masse<sup>1,9</sup>, Jon Boyer<sup>1,9</sup>, Minjune Kim<sup>5</sup>, Jinhan  
5 Mo<sup>4</sup>, Nicole R. LeBoeuf<sup>1,10,†</sup>, Ju Li<sup>1,5,†</sup>, Peter K. Sorger<sup>1,3,6,†</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup> Greater Boston Pandemic Fabrication Team (PanFab) c/o Harvard-MIT Center for Regulatory Science,  
7 Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

8 <sup>2</sup> Harvard-MIT Division of Health Sciences & Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA

9 <sup>3</sup> Harvard Ludwig Cancer Research Center and Department of Systems Biology, Harvard Medical School,  
10 Boston, MA, USA

11 <sup>4</sup> Beijing Key Laboratory of Indoor Air Quality Evaluation and Control, Department of Building Science,  
12 Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

13 <sup>5</sup> Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering and Department of Materials Science and Engineering,  
14 MIT, Cambridge, MA, USA

15 <sup>6</sup> Harvard-MIT Center for Regulatory Science, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

16 <sup>7</sup> Computational Health Informatics Program, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

17 <sup>8</sup> Department of Dermatology, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT USA

18 <sup>9</sup> Environmental Affairs, Brigham & Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

19 <sup>10</sup> Department of Dermatology, Center for Cutaneous Oncology, Brigham and Women's Hospital; Dana-  
20 Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA, USA

21

22 \*These authors contributed equally to this work

23 †Co-corresponding authors. E-mails: [nleboeuf@bwh.harvard.edu](mailto:nleboeuf@bwh.harvard.edu); [liju@mit.edu](mailto:liju@mit.edu);

24 [peter\\_sorger@hms.harvard.edu](mailto:peter_sorger@hms.harvard.edu) cc: [Maureen\\_Bergeron@hms.harvard.edu](mailto:Maureen_Bergeron@hms.harvard.edu);

25

26 ORCID IDs:

27 Deborah Plana, 0000-0002-4218-1693

28 Enze Tian, 0000-0001-6410-5360

29 Avilash Cramer, 0000-0003-0014-8921

30 Mary Carmack, 0000-0003-4546-790X

31 Michael S. Sinha, MD, JD, MPH, 0000-0002-9165-8611

32 Florence T. Bourgeois, MD, MPH 0000-0001-7798-4560

33 Sherry H. Yu, MD, 0000-0002-1432-9128

34 Nicole R. LeBoeuf, MD, MPH, 0000-0002-8264-834X

35 Ju Li, PhD, 0000-0002-7841-8058

36 Peter Sorger, PhD, 0000-0002-3364-1838

37

38

39

40

41 **ABSTRACT**

42 **Background:** During the current COVID-19 pandemic, supply chains for Personal Protective Equipment  
43 (PPE) have been severely disrupted and many products, particularly surgical N95 filtering facepiece  
44 respirators (FFRs; “masks”) are in short supply. As a consequence, an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA)  
45 from the FDA has allowed importation of N95-type masks manufactured to international standards; these  
46 include KN95 masks from China and FFP2 masks from the European Union.

47 **Methods:** We conducted a survey of mask in the inventory of major academic medical centers in Boston,  
48 MA to determine provenance and manufacturer. We then assembled a simple apparatus for performing a  
49 necessary (but not sufficient) test of filtration performance and tested masks from the inventory; an  
50 accompanying website shows how to build and use the testing apparatus.

51 **Results:** Our survey showed that, seven months after the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, over 100  
52 different makes and models of N95-type masks are in the inventory of local hospitals as opposed to 2-5  
53 models under normal circumstances. A substantial number of unfamiliar masks are from unknown  
54 manufacturers. Many did not perform to accepted standards and are likely to be counterfeit. Due to the  
55 absence of publicly available information on mask suppliers in the FDA EUA and confusing or inconsistent  
56 labeling of KN95 masks, it is difficult to distinguish legitimate and counterfeit products.

57 **Conclusions:** Many of the FFR masks available for procurement during the COVID-19 pandemic do not  
58 provide levels of fit and filtration similar to those of N95 masks and are not acceptable for use in healthcare  
59 settings. Based on these results, and in consultation with occupational health officers, we make six  
60 recommendations for end users to assist in acquiring legitimate products. In particular, institutions should  
61 always assess masks from non-traditional supply chains by checking their markings and manufacturer  
62 information against data provided by NIOSH and the latest FDA EUA Appendix A. In the absence of  
63 verifiable information on the legitimacy of mask source, institutions should consider measuring mask fit and  
64 filtration directly. We also make suggestions for U.S and Chinese regulatory agencies with regard to  
65 labeling and public disclosure aimed at increase pandemic resilience.

66 **Keywords:** N95, KN95, FFR (filtering facepiece respirator), PPE (personal protective equipment), COVID-  
67 19, filtration testing, NIOSH, FDA EUA (Emergency Use Authorization), occupational health, regulatory  
68 science

69

## 70 **BACKGROUND**

71 Filtering facepiece respirators (FFRs) such as N95 masks are the primary mode of respiratory  
72 protection for healthcare workers treating infectious agents that are airborne or transmissible via aerosols  
73 (1). As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, demand for N95 masks and other personal protective  
74 equipment (PPE) has greatly outstripped supply, leading to widespread and persistent shortages. In the US,  
75 surgical N95 FFRs used in healthcare are regulated by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and  
76 Health (NIOSH), a part of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and by the Food and  
77 Drug Administration (FDA) as described in US Code of Federal Regulations 42 CFR part 84 (2). Similar  
78 standards and enforcement mechanisms exist in other industrialized countries (3). Some FFRs with the  
79 filtering properties of healthcare N95 masks, including industrial N95 masks and elastomeric respirators,  
80 commonly have exhalation valves; such devices are traditionally not permitted for use healthcare settings  
81 because air exhaled through the valve is unfiltered, precluding the maintenance of a sterile field (4).  
82 Unfiltered exhalation through valves is also a possible avenue of disease transmission.

83 Very high demand for N95 respirators, coupled with disruption of medical supply chains, has led to  
84 a severe shortage of respiratory protection for healthcare workers during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic (5).  
85 In February 2020, the FDA issued the first in a series of Emergency Use Authorizations (EUAs) relaxing  
86 regulations on N95 masks to help increase supply (6). These EUAs permitted the use in U.S. healthcare  
87 settings of masks manufactured for industrial use as well as of non-NIOSH approved masks meeting foreign  
88 standards functionally equivalent to those for N95 masks. As described in the EUAs “[Authorized Imported,](#)  
89 [Non-NIOSH Disposable Filtering Facepiece Respirators](#)” and “[Non-NIOSH Approved Disposable Filtering](#)  
90 [Facepiece Respirators Manufactured in China](#)” authorized masks include KN95 masks manufactured in

91 China to the GB2626-2006 standard (7), FFP2 masks manufactured to European standard EN 149:2001, and  
92 masks manufactured in Australia, Brazil, Japan, Korea, and Mexico to other trusted performance standards  
93 (we refer to these collectively as N95-type masks) (8). As a practical matter, however, masks from China  
94 are the most common of these masks, reflecting China’s role as a leading producer of medical supplies.

95 Manufacturing N95-equivalent masks requires special fabrics and careful quality control and such  
96 masks must exhibit three essential functional properties: 1) the ability to filter out small particles (in the case  
97 of N95s, 95% of particles of the most penetrating aerosol size tested – typically down to 0.3  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter);  
98 2) a tight fit to the face so that inhaled air is directed through the filter fabric and not around the side of the  
99 mask; and 3) low inhalation resistance so that a user does not experience difficulty breathing. Unfortunately  
100 data from the CDC (9) and other groups (10) has shown that, subsequent to the EUA permitting their use in  
101 US healthcare, some respirators manufactured overseas and labeled as N95, FFP2, or KN95 fail to perform  
102 as expected for filtration and fit. While this might be a consequence of manufacturing defects, it appears  
103 more likely that many of these non-performing respirators are counterfeit or claim adherence to standards  
104 that they never intended to meet (11). While a number of Chinese-brand respirators have performed well in  
105 quality testing, both unfamiliar products and counterfeits of known Chinese brands have been found in the  
106 US supply. Unfortunately, fraudulent packaging poor labelling practices can make it difficult to determine if  
107 a given respirator is genuine or not.

108 The first version of the FDA EUA on “Non-NIOSH Approved Disposable Filtering Facepiece  
109 Respirators Manufactured in China” (February 2020) included a list of authorized respirators and vendors in  
110 “Appendix A,” but no testing data was required from purported manufacturers to corroborate performance  
111 claims. As described below, it is hard to even identify the business addresses or websites of many of  
112 suppliers on Appendix A. Subsequent to the FDA EUA, the CDC noted a dramatic increase in counterfeit  
113 respirators with labeling that misrepresented such products as having been approved to NIOSH or  
114 equivalent foreign agencies (11). The CDC therefore began a program of performance testing and on May 7,  
115 2020 the FDA substantially shortened Appendix A based on data demonstrating widespread inadequacies in

116 filtration efficiency (12). The CDC continues to evaluate masks and to post photographs of the mask  
117 packaging for known counterfeit products, while the FDA continues to refine Appendix A. The most recent  
118 version Appendix A (issued on June 9, 2020) includes 144 FFR models from 86 manufacturers, down from  
119 148 models and 68 manufacturers on July 13, 2020 (13).

120 In this paper we consider the problem of non-traditional N95-type masks from the perspective of an  
121 end user involved in healthcare, specifically large teaching hospitals affiliated with Harvard Medical School  
122 (HMS). For these users, one consequence of supply chain disruption and the initially permissive FDA EUA  
123 is that a large number of unfamiliar models of N95-type masks have become available (14), some of which  
124 come through irregular supply chains (14) or are donated and have unclear provenance. In a healthcare  
125 setting, fit testing masks on individual users is standard (e.g. using the 3M FT-30 qualitative fit test kit) (15),  
126 but hospitals are rarely if ever equipped to measure filtration efficiency (14). Such testing is usually  
127 performed by manufacturers either in-house or by commercial pre-certification laboratories on behalf of  
128 manufacturers. In the absence of such capabilities, end users are forced to evaluate masks from dozens of  
129 unknown manufacturers based on little or no information. In this paper, we attempt to assess the impact of  
130 these issues.

131 We inventoried masks on hand at HMS hospitals; attempted to match vendors and models to  
132 information in the FDA EUA Appendix A, and selected a subset for performance testing. We describe a  
133 simple filtration testing instrument assembled from commonly available components that can be used to  
134 determine if a mask is likely to meet performance standards: the instrument does not guarantee performance  
135 to N95-type standards but no legitimate mask should fail to exhibit at least 95% filtration efficiency using  
136 the apparatus we describe. We demonstrate multiple labeling and performance problems with non-  
137 traditional N95-style masks and formulate a set of recommendations to help guide healthcare organizations  
138 and other users in assessing mask donations and purchases. We also suggest ways in which the FDA and  
139 CDC can improve future EUAs.

140

## 141 METHODS

142 Samples of N95-type masks 70 mm × 70 mm in size were cut from each mask and inserted into a  
143 circular acrylic air duct with an inner diameter of 50 mm (**Figure 1**). Either ambient particles or KCl aerosol  
144 particles were driven through the respirator filter using air flow to serve as a pollutant source. KCl aerosol  
145 was generated by a Collision Nebulizer (BGI Inc., USA) using 10 wt% KCl solution with the volume of free  
146 air set at 1 L/min. The concentration of 0.3-10 μm particles was determined using an optical particle counter  
147 (Aerotrak 9306, TSI Inc., USA). Concentrations were recorded twice at a one-minute intervals both  
148 upstream and downstream of the respirator filter, and the measurements then repeated once. The single-pass  
149 filtration efficiency  $\eta(d_p)$  of particles with a size of  $d_p$  (μm) was calculated over an 8-minute test period as  
150 follows:

$$151 \quad \eta(d_p) = \left( \frac{C_{up}(d_p) - C_{down}(d_p)}{C_{up}(d_p)} \right) \times 100\%$$

152 where  $C_{up}$  and  $C_{down}$  are the average particle counts (pcs) upstream and downstream of the filter,  
153 respectively. The pressure drop across the filter was measured by using a differential gauge. The air  
154 temperature was nominally  $T = 24 \pm 1$  °C and relative humidity  $30 \pm 20\%$ ; these values were not controlled  
155 but were measured along with air face velocity (which was typically in the range of 0.1 to 0.3 m/s) using a  
156 mini thermo-anemometer located at the air duct exhaust. Further information about the construction and use  
157 of this filter-testing instrument can be found at <http://cleanmask.org>.

158

## 159 RESULTS

### 160 Qualitative examination of mask labeling helps identify legitimate respirators

161 To assess the diversity of the mask supply available for use during the COVID-19 pandemic, we  
162 inventoried models and makes of respirators, many donated, from HMS-affiliated medical centers in  
163 Boston, MA. We identified over 100 brands and models in the inventory. In contrast under, standard non-  
164 emergency conditions only two masks models, both from a traditional domestic manufacturer and provided

165 via a familiar supply chain, would normally be in the inventory of the hospitals surveyed (**Table 1**). A  
166 substantial number of the masks on hand originate from unknown vendors and appear to be of Chinese  
167 origin (based on the writing on the box). Many lacked even basic information such as manufacturer address  
168 or website, and respirator model numbers were generally lacking (**Figure 3C**). In some cases visual  
169 inspection revealed that masks in this inventory were similar in appearance or packaging to masks identified  
170 as counterfeit by the CDC and posted on their website (11). Moreover, a substantial number of masks listed  
171 multiple regulatory approvals from different countries. However, no mask claiming compliance to N95  
172 standards should also claim compliance with KN95 or FFP2 standards because these are different, even if  
173 functionally similar (e.g. **Figure 3B**; label #2, **Supplementary Material 2**). Any mask claiming multiple  
174 non-identical regulatory approvals is *prima facie* counterfeit. Several masks additionally including labels  
175 such as “PM 2.5” that are typically meant to denote protection from nuisance dust and air pollutants (label  
176 #6, **Supplementary Material 2**). Such masks are likely fraudulently relabeled simply by stamping “N95”  
177 or “KN95” on the box.

178         After excluding brands that were visibly counterfeit based on these criteria, 18 of the most  
179 commonly donated mask models from the inventory were selected for further study. These masks had  
180 identifiable manufacturer markings and included two FFP2, nine KN95, and eight N95 respirators. In  
181 addition to the nine KN95 masks with markings, six unmarked KN95 masks that had been provided in bulk  
182 were selected for further investigation. N95 masks meeting NIOSH standards must have TC-approval  
183 numbers (11) printed on the mask and must be listed on the NIOSH Certified Equipment List (CEL) (16) or  
184 the NIOSH Trusted-Source list (17) (e.g. **Figure 3A**; label #24, **Supplementary Material 2**). NIOSH has  
185 an excellent infographic illustrating the correct labeling of N95 masks that we reproduce in supplementary  
186 materials for convenience (**Supplementary Material 1**). These CEL and Trusted-Source lists pre-date the  
187 COVID-19 pandemic and contain information on FFRs that would normally be available through traditional  
188 healthcare supply chains; several are manufactured in China. All eight N95 mask models evaluated had  
189 valid TC numbers and information could easily be obtained on them by searching the manufacturers’



190 websites. This is not necessarily a sufficient test for legitimacy because the CDC has reported that some  
191 counterfeiters steal TC- numbers from legitimate suppliers (11).

192 Masks claiming compliance with KN95 and FFR2 standards were cross-referenced with the FDA  
193 Appendix A list (13) and assessed for a valid business website associated with the brand. Neither of the  
194 FFP2 masks in our inventory are presently listed on Appendix A of the FDA EUA (13) (**Table 1**). Data on  
195 3M K112 is readily available (18) and appears to be widely distributed in Europe but we found no reliable  
196 information on the Guangzhou Kanglv 9501 model (labels #1 and #2 respectively, **Supplementary**  
197 **Material 2**). Nine of the KN95 masks tested had markings on their surface or packaging and six were  
198 completely unmarked. Of the nine marked KN95 masks studied in detail, two were listed on Appendix A  
199 initially but one (Jinan VHOLD Co. VH95, label #7, **Supplementary Material 2**) was removed as of July  
200 13, 2020 leaving only aRUN Industrial Co. N9 (Label #4); seven could not be matched to any brand or  
201 model on Appendix A based on information on the packaging or the mask itself (**Table 1**; labels #3 and 5, 6  
202 and 8-11). Six additional KN95 mask types were completely unmarked and could therefore not be checked  
203 against Appendix A or a manufacturer's website (**Figure 3C**; Labels #12-17, **Supplementary Material 2**).

204

## 205 **Testing mask performance**

206 We subjected the masks described above to filtration performance testing at a university laboratory  
207 (**Figure 2**). Testing was performed on both ambient particulate matter and aerosolized potassium chloride  
208 (KCl) in the size range 0.3 to 10  $\mu\text{m}$ , a relevant range for N95 FFRs. Passing this test is not sufficient to  
209 establish conformity with NIOSH, EN149 or GB2626 standards since all three involve a range of tests for  
210 multiple performance characteristics under carefully controlled conditions (3). However, we have found that  
211 results obtained using our testing system conform well to tests performed at a commercial pre-certification  
212 laboratory to NIOSH standards (see <http://cleanmask.org/procedures> for further details). Our testing  
213 revealed that all N95 masks and a subset of KN95 masks performed as expected in that they repeatedly  
214 removed >95% of particles down to 0.3  $\mu\text{m}$ . However, a substantial number of KN95 models, both marked



215 and unmarked, failed testing and one unmarked mask released more particles than were present at the input  
216 of the testing apparatus, which presents *negative* filtration performance (**Figure 2; Supplementary**  
217 **Material 3**). The single KN95 mask tested that is still listed on Appendix A exhibited greater than 95%  
218 filtration efficiency (aRUN Industrial Co. N9) whereas one mask model formerly on the FDA EUA  
219 Appendix A demonstrated less than 95% filtration efficiency (Jinan VHOLD Co., LTD Model VH95).  
220 These data confirm results from other sources, including the CDC (11) that poorly performing masks make  
221 up a substantial portion of the inventory of non-domestic N95 type masks available in major academic  
222 medical centers in the US. Fortunately, as of writing, none of the mask models analyzed in this paper saw  
223 use in clinical practice and they are currently being stored for potential emergency use.

224 Fit is a critical feature of N95-equivalent masks and is typically evaluated by end users using OSHA-  
225 regulated fit tests. It has been observed that KN95 masks with ear loops instead of headband straps often fail  
226 fit testing and this is a factor that must be considered when choosing a product (7,11,19). We have recently  
227 described devices for improving the fit of such masks using secondary mask frames (20). We observed that  
228 some masks labelled KN95 (a subset of the unmarked KN95s in **Figure 2**) have thin perforations and may  
229 also have embossed ‘KN95’ lettering that exposes the thin filter layer. This makes the masks particularly  
230 fragile and subject to ripping when donned. Such masks should probably be avoided.

231

## 232 **DISCUSSION**

233 A growing number of investigators and Federal agencies have reported that many N95-equivalent  
234 masks manufactured overseas whose distribution in the US became possible due to recent FDA EUAs do  
235 not perform to relevant US and international standards (11). Our data show that, several months into the  
236 COVID-19 pandemic, these under-performing masks made up a substantial portion of the donated inventory  
237 at major medical centers in the US (**Figure 2**). Our performance testing, although limited in scope, suggests  
238 that some masks perform very poorly, removing only 8% - 80% of 0.3  $\mu\text{m}$  particles; alarmingly, at least one  
239 mask added particulate matter to the airstream and therefore had negative efficiency. In many cases these

240 masks claim compliance with multiple non-identical regulatory standards and they are clearly counterfeits.  
241 Remarkably, several models of KN95 that passed preliminary performance testing had little or no  
242 identifying markings, or had labelling that was inconsistent with listings in FDA EUA Appendix A: even  
243 legitimate KN95 masks lack vendor-specific information similar to the TC numbers required by NIOSH on  
244 all N95 masks. We devoted substantial effort to tracking down information on these KN95 masks but in  
245 many cases could not find corresponding manufacturers, distributors or informational websites. We  
246 conclude that is impossible in many cases to determine whether a KN95 mask is legitimate or not based on  
247 the label or packaging. Unfortunately, this would appear to be an ideal setting for counterfeiters.

248

### 249 **Recommendations for end users**

250 Based on the current study, and in consultation with environmental and occupational health offices  
251 at three different hospitals, we propose the following guidelines for sourcing N95-equivalent masks:

- 252 1. **Use trusted supply chains.** Whenever possible, use trusted supply chains to provide products and  
253 ask for the technical datasheets or certification documents for a specific brand and model. These  
254 documents should not contain obvious spelling or grammatical errors. For all N95 and FFP2 that  
255 passed testing, these materials could easily be located on manufacturer websites.
- 256 2. **For FFRs claiming N95 certification,** check for active and correct TC numbers on the [NIOSH](#)  
257 [Certified Equipment List \(CEL\)](#) or the [NIOSH Trusted-Source](#). Check that the TC number matches  
258 the style and manufacturer of the mask. Check that all other information matches NIOSH  
259 requirements (see infographic in **Supplementary Figure 1**).
- 260 3. **Check for similarity to a fraudulent product on the [NIOSH Web site](#).** We recommend sending  
261 pictures of products falsely labelled as “N95” to the CDC so the agency can expand its on-line  
262 gallery and assist others in identifying products that should not be used under any circumstances.  
263 Even seemingly high-quality packaging can hide a nonfunctional product.

- 264 4. **For FFRs claiming compliance to a non-US standard (e.g. KN95s, FFP2s)**, check if masks are on  
265 the [FDA Appendix A](#) or [Exhibit 1](#) lists of respirators authorized for importation under EUA. Also  
266 check the [CDC Assessment Results for Not NIOSH-approved respirators](#) for filtration performance.  
267 If the mask is not on the list, it can be submitted for testing on the CDC [International Respirator](#)  
268 [Assessment Request](#) page.
- 269 5. **Check for inconsistent markings.** No FFP2/3, KN95, DS/DL, P2/3, or PFF product should bear a  
270 NIOSH stamp since NIOSH only certifies the US N95 standard (the reciprocal is also true).  
271 Additionally, fraudulent products often carry multiple labels (KN95, N95, FFP2). A list of different  
272 respirator certifications by nation is available at the CDC Website:  
273 <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/respirators/testing/NonNIOSH.html>.
- 274 6. **Consider independently performing filtration testing** in the absence of verifiable manufacturer  
275 information for a specific mask. This can be accomplished by submitting the mask for testing to a  
276 CDC or a NIOSH-approved commercial facility. Some institutions may want to consider using their  
277 own testing apparatus, as described in the methods section of this paper and at <http://cleanmask.org>.  
278 Fit testing should be performed on all masks used in a healthcare setting.

279

280 For large donations of respirators from unknown suppliers, we recommend that quality assurance  
281 testing, including filtration testing, be performed before the respirators are issued to healthcare providers or  
282 other frontline personnel. Although we recognize that such testing is difficult to perform for many  
283 independent institutions, commercial pre-certification laboratories are able to provide this service at a  
284 reasonable cost and turnaround time. For example, the Manufacturing Emergency Response Team ([M-ERT](#))  
285 has [collaborated with a network of local testing laboratories](#) across Massachusetts in response to the  
286 pandemic; their ability to provide functional testing of N95-type masks contributes to community resiliency.  
287 The possibility that counterfeit masks can have negative filtration efficiency strongly suggests that masks of

288 unknown provenance, or masks whose manufacturer cannot be independently verified should not be used.  
289 High quality surgical masks are likely to be a safer option.

290

## 291 **CONCLUSIONS**

292         The inconsistent and at times bewildering labeling on KN95 masks makes it difficult to identify  
293 manufacturers and determine if they are legitimate products. We recommend that all N95-type masks have  
294 identifying information printed directly on the product that identifies their manufacturer, such as numbers  
295 functionally similar to TC numbers for N95 masks. We also recommend that the FDA make public all data  
296 submitted by manufacturers listed in EUA Appendix A. All companies should be required to provide basic  
297 operational data including name and place of business, proprietary or brand name, model number, marketing  
298 authorization, a copy of the product labeling and evidence of authorization with quality management  
299 systems for healthcare devices (e.g. through 21 CFR Part 820, ISO 13485 or an equivalent) (21). Any  
300 legitimate company will have this information immediately available, although it may initially be provided  
301 in a foreign language. Such information is readily available for standard NIOSH-approved N95 masks, and  
302 this provides a template for Appendix A as well (e.g. a [listing of approved surgical N95](#) manufacturers and  
303 models that include links to legitimate corporate websites and donning instructions).

304         Since the initial EUA issuance, the FDA has twice amended information on non-NIOSH approved  
305 masks, once in May and once in June, to improve supply chain oversight. Additional criteria have been  
306 established for Appendix A listings including required CE marks (Conformité Européenne, denoting health,  
307 safety, and environmental protection standards for products sold within the European Economic Area(22))  
308 or NMPA certification (National Medical Products Administration, a Chinese government agency for  
309 regulating pharmaceuticals, medical devices, and cosmetics (23)), to ascertain certification from a trusted  
310 notified body. The FDA and CDC have also initiated a large-scale testing program to randomly sample  
311 respirators imported from China and test their filtration ability, but this will be of limited use without a  
312 method for end users to link information on foreign-manufactured masks with test results, such as through

313 use of TC and/or lot numbers. We also recommend stronger oversight of the respirator supply chain by  
314 Federal regulatory agencies, including required performance testing of non-NIOSH approved respirators  
315 prior to distribution, even in times of crisis. As the current pandemic evolves, generating and maintaining an  
316 updated list of trusted alternate suppliers will leave us better prepared for current and future supply  
317 shortages.

318

### 319 **Limitations of this study**

320 The testing performed in this study uses readily available equipment but is not equivalent to NIOSH-  
321 approved testing. We have collected data on a set of N95 masks exposed to various sterilization procedures  
322 using the equipment described here and also using testing to NIOSH standards at a commercial laboratory  
323 (ICS Laboratories, USA; equipped to perform NIOSH pre-certification testing) (24). Instantaneous filtration  
324 efficiency values measured in the two tests for different masks of the same model undergoing the same  
325 sterilization procedure had a correlation coefficient of 0.89 and all masks demonstrating greater than 95%  
326 filtration efficiency also passed ICS tests (and vice versa; see [cleanmask.org](http://cleanmask.org)). We therefore conclude that  
327 our testing procedure provides a reasonable estimate of filtration performance for N95-type masks.  
328 Nonetheless, the results described here should be interpreted as relative, not absolute, measures of filtration  
329 efficiency and no mask should be considered suitable for human use based on our data alone.

330

### 331 **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

332 CDC: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

333 CEL: Certified Equipment List

334 EUA: Emergency Use Authorization

335 FDA: Food and Drug Administration

336 FFRs: Filtering Facepiece Respirator

337 NIOSH: National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health

338 PPE: Personal Protective Equipment

339

## 340 **DECLARATIONS**

### 341 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

342 Not applicable.

343

### 344 **Consent for publication**

345 Not applicable.

346

### 347 **Availability of data and materials**

348 All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary  
349 information files.

350

### 351 **Competing interests**

352 • PK Sorger is a member of the SAB or Board of Directors of Applied Biomath, Glencoe Software and  
353 RareCyte Inc and has equity in these companies. In the last five years the Sorger lab has received  
354 research funding from Novartis and Merck. Sorger declares that none of these relationships are directly  
355 or indirectly related to the content of this manuscript.

356 • NR LeBoeuf is a consultant for or has received honoraria from the following companies: Seattle  
357 Genetics, Sanofi and Bayer.

358 • J Li has consulted for L2 Infinity LLC, which imports personal protective equipment into the US.

### 359 **Funding**

360 Local fabricators, makers and citizens generously donated their time and resources and were essential for all  
361 stages of the project. This work was also supported by the Harvard MIT Center for Regulatory Sciences and

362 by NIH/NCI grants U54-CA225088 (to PKS, NL and DP) and by T32-GM007753 (to DP) and by the  
363 Harvard Ludwig Center.

364

365 **Author Contributions**

366 Assessing mask donations: S.H.Y., P.M., J.B.

367 Mask filtration testing: E.T, J.M., J.L.

368 Website construction: M.K.

369 Writing: D.P., E.T., A.K.C., H.Y., M.M.C, M.S.S., F.T.B., S.H.Y., N.R.L, J.L., P.K.S.

370 Greater Boston Pandemic Fabrication Team (PanFab) Consortium Coordination: D.P., H.Y., P.K.S.

371

372 **Acknowledgements** Above all we thank the members of the Greater Boston Pandemic Fabrication Team

373 (PanFab) for technical, administrative, and logistic support necessary for the execution of this project.

374 Membership found at <https://www.panfab.org/the-team-and-the-project/consortium-members>. Local

375 fabricators, makers and citizens generously donated their time and resources and were essential for all stages

376 of the project. This work was also supported by the Harvard MIT Center for Regulatory Sciences and by

377 NIH/NCI grants U54-CA225088 (to PKS, NRL and DP) and by T32-GM007753 (to DP) and by the

378 Harvard Ludwig Center.

379

380

381



382 **REFERENCES**

383

- 384 1. Eninger RM, Honda T, Adhikari A, Heinonen-Tanski H, Reponen T, Grinshpun SA. FILTER  
385 PERFORMANCE OF N99 AND N95 FACEPIECE RESPIRATORS AGAINST VIRUSES AND  
386 ULTRAFINE PARTICLES. *Ann Occup Hyg.* 2008 Jul;52(5):385–96.
- 387 2. CDC - NPPTL - NIOSH-Approved Particulate Filtering Facepiece Respirators [Internet]. 2020 [cited  
388 2020 May 29]. Available from:  
389 [https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/topics/respirators/disp\\_part/default.html](https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/topics/respirators/disp_part/default.html)
- 390 3. Comparison of FFP2, KN95, and N95 and Other Filtering Facepiece Respirator Classes. Technical  
391 Bulletin. Revision 4. [Internet]. 3M; 2020. Available from:  
392 [https://multimedia.3m.com/mws/media/17915000/comparison-ffp2-kn95-n95-filtering-facepiece-](https://multimedia.3m.com/mws/media/17915000/comparison-ffp2-kn95-n95-filtering-facepiece-respirator-classes-tb.pdf)  
393 [respirator-classes-tb.pdf](https://multimedia.3m.com/mws/media/17915000/comparison-ffp2-kn95-n95-filtering-facepiece-respirator-classes-tb.pdf)
- 394 4. Ancillary Respirator Information, Healthcare FAQs | NPPTL | NIOSH | CDC [Internet]. 2020 [cited  
395 2020 Jul 14]. Available from:  
396 [https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/topics/respirators/disp\\_part/respsource3healthcare.html](https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/topics/respirators/disp_part/respsource3healthcare.html)
- 397 5. Shortage of personal protective equipment endangering health workers worldwide [Internet]. World  
398 Health Organization. [cited 2020 Jun 27]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/03-](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/03-03-2020-shortage-of-personal-protective-equipment-endangering-health-workers-worldwide)  
399 [03-2020-shortage-of-personal-protective-equipment-endangering-health-workers-worldwide](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/03-03-2020-shortage-of-personal-protective-equipment-endangering-health-workers-worldwide)
- 400 6. Emergency Use Authorizations [Internet]. FDA. FDA; 2020 [cited 2020 May 9]. Available from:  
401 <https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use->  
402 [authorizations](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations)
- 403 7. International Respirator Assessment Request | NPPTL | NIOSH | CDC [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun  
404 10]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/respirators/testing/NonNIOSH.html>
- 405 8. CEN/TC 79 - Respiratory protective devices [Internet]. CEN- European Committee on  
406 Standardization. [cited 2020 Jun 10]. Available from:  
407 <https://standards.cen.eu/dyn/www/f?p=204:110:0:::FC98AD34A5EE26A0CB5A6155ED4D6E5E>  
408 [FC98AD34A5EE26A0CB5A6155ED4D6E5E](https://standards.cen.eu/dyn/www/f?p=204:110:0:::FC98AD34A5EE26A0CB5A6155ED4D6E5E)
- 409 9. International Assessment Results | NPPTL | NIOSH | CDC [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 10].  
410 Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/respirators/testing/NonNIOSHresults.html>
- 411 10. Commonwealth of Massachusetts. KN95 Respirator Test Results [Internet]. Mass.gov. 2020 [cited  
412 2020 Jun 10]. Available from: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/kn95-respirator-test-results>
- 413 11. Counterfeit Respirators / Misrepresentation of NIOSH-Approval | NPPTL | NIOSH | CDC [Internet].  
414 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 26]. Available from:  
415 <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/usernotices/counterfeitResp.html>
- 416 12. Denise M. Hinton. Manufacturers of Imported, Non-NIOSH-Approved Disposable Filtering Facepiece  
417 Respirators; Health Care Personnel; Hospital Purchasing Departments and Distributors; Importers and  
418 Commercial Wholesalers; and Any Other Applicable Stakeholders. [Internet]. Food and Drug  
419 Administration; 2020. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/media/136664/download>

- 420 13. Appendix A: Authorized Respirators [Internet]. FDA; 2020. Available from:  
421 <https://www.fda.gov/media/136663/download>
- 422 14. Artenstein AW. In Pursuit of PPE. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020 Apr 17;0(0):e46.
- 423 15. 3M™ Qualitative Fit Test Apparatus FT-30, Bitter 1 EA/Case [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jul 22]. Available  
424 from: [https://www.3m.com/3M/en\\_US/company-us/all-3m-products/~3M-Qualitative-Fit-Test-](https://www.3m.com/3M/en_US/company-us/all-3m-products/~3M-Qualitative-Fit-Test-Apparatus-FT-30-Bitter-1-EA-Case/?N=5002385+3294795973&rt=rud)  
425 [Apparatus-FT-30-Bitter-1-EA-Case/?N=5002385+3294795973&rt=rud](https://www.3m.com/3M/en_US/company-us/all-3m-products/~3M-Qualitative-Fit-Test-Apparatus-FT-30-Bitter-1-EA-Case/?N=5002385+3294795973&rt=rud)
- 426 16. Certified Equipment List | NPPTL | NIOSH | CDC [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 10]. Available  
427 from: <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/topics/respirators/cel/default.html>
- 428 17. Respirator Trusted-Source Information | NPPTL | NIOSH | CDC [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 10].  
429 Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/topics/respirators/disp\\_part/respsource.html](https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/topics/respirators/disp_part/respsource.html)
- 430 18. 3M™ Disposable Respirator, FFP2, Valved, K112 [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jul 23]. Available from:  
431 [https://www.3m.com/3M/en\\_NG/company-mea/all-3m-products/~3M-Disposable-Respirator-FFP2-](https://www.3m.com/3M/en_NG/company-mea/all-3m-products/~3M-Disposable-Respirator-FFP2-Valved-K112/?N=5002385+3294470405&rt=rud)  
432 [Valved-K112/?N=5002385+3294470405&rt=rud](https://www.3m.com/3M/en_NG/company-mea/all-3m-products/~3M-Disposable-Respirator-FFP2-Valved-K112/?N=5002385+3294470405&rt=rud)
- 433 19. Anderegg L, Meisenhelder C, Ngooi CO, Liao L, Xiao W, Chu S, et al. A scalable method of applying  
434 heat and humidity for decontamination of N95 respirators during the COVID-19 crisis. Mukherjee A,  
435 editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2020 Jul 1;15(7):e0234851.
- 436 20. The “Double Eights Mask Brace” Improves the Fit and Protection and Protection of a Basic Surgical  
437 Mask Amidst Covid-19 Pandemic | medRxiv [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jul 14]. Available from:  
438 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.18.20099325v1>
- 439 21. FAQs on the EUAs for Non-NIOSH Approved Respirators During the COVID-19 Pandemic  
440 [Internet]. FDA. FDA; 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 10]. Available from: [https://www.fda.gov/medical-](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/faqs-euas-non-niosh-approved-respirators-during-covid-19-pandemic)  
441 [devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/faqs-euas-non-niosh-approved-respirators-during-](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/faqs-euas-non-niosh-approved-respirators-during-covid-19-pandemic)  
442 [covid-19-pandemic](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/faqs-euas-non-niosh-approved-respirators-during-covid-19-pandemic)
- 443 22. CE marking [Internet]. European Commission website. 2016 [cited 2020 Jul 23]. Available from:  
444 [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/single-market/ce-marking\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/single-market/ce-marking_en)
- 445 23. About NMPA [Internet]. National Medical Products Administration. [cited 2020 Jul 23]. Available  
446 from: <http://english.nmpa.gov.cn/aboutNMPA.html>
- 447 24. Cramer A, Plana D, Yang HL, Carmack M, Tian E, Sinha MS, et al. Analysis of SteraMist ionized  
448 hydrogen peroxide technology as a method for sterilizing N95 respirators and other personal protective  
449 equipment [Internet]. *Occupational and Environmental Health*; 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Apr 24].  
450 Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.19.20069997>

451

452


453 **TABLES AND FIGURES**

454 **Table 1:** Mask models donated to major academic medical centers in Boston during the COVID-19  
455 pandemic and their corresponding regulatory designation. Highlighted models indicate masks models that  
456 underwent filtration testing at academic medical center. N95 model certification was checked in the NIOSH  
457 Certified Equipment List. \*Known counterfeit masks are listed on CDC  
458 website; Suspected counterfeit masks were identified by guidance listed on the same website. \*\* Jinan  
459 VHOLD Co LTD VH95 was later removed from Appendix A.

460

461


462  
463



464  
465

466 **Figure 1. Apparatus assembled from common components and used to test FFRs in this study. Details**  
467 **of the fabrication and use of this device for testing the filtration ion efficiency of N95-type masks using**  
468 **ambient particles and KCl droplets can be found in supplementary materials and at**  
469 **<http://cleanmask.org/setup>. No legitimate FFR should demonstrate less than 95% filtration efficiency using**  
470 **this test, but testing performed with this apparatus is not sufficient to confirm performance to U.S.,**  
471 **European, Chinese or other regulatory standards. Such testing involves a wider range of conditions, greater**  
472 **control over test conditions and a formal approach to quality assurance and calibration.**

473



474 ○ Ambient △ KCl ● NIOSH N95 ● Appendix A ● Not on Appendix A ● Formerly on Appendix A

475

476 **Figure 2: Filtration efficiency of N95-type masks using ambient particles and aerosolized KCl**

477 **particles as testing agents.** The lowest filtration efficiency recorded for any particle size tested in shown;

478 full data are provided in Supplementary Table 3. Masks are grouped based on the testing standard they

479 comply with (FFP2, KN95, or N95) but some masks incorrectly claim compliance with multiple standards.

480 “NIOSH N95” refers to masks appearing on the list of *NIOSH-Approved N95 Particulate Filtering*

481 *Facepiece Respirators* and regulated according to US standards; six of these models are manufactured in the

482 US and the Rizhao and San Huei masks are manufactured in China; all of these masks were available on the

483 US market prior to the current COVID pandemic. “Appendix A” refers to masks that are listed in the FDA


484 EUA “*Non-NIOSH Approved Disposable Filtering Facepiece Respirators Manufactured in China*” first

485 issued on February 2020 and subsequently updated. These masks have been made available only as a result

486 of the pandemic.

487





488

489

**Figure 3. Images of a subset of masks subjected to performance testing and manufactured in China.**

490

**A.** A dome-type mask manufactured to N95 standards and listed on the NIOSH website for sale in the U.S.

491

that has all of the required markings. This mask performed as expected (Figure 2, line 24). **B.** A flat-fold

492

mask that claims compliance with European FFP2 but contains an FDA logo, which is not allowable. This

493

mask performed well in our tests across all particle sizes and has the performance expected of a legitimate

494

product (Figure 2, line 2). **C.** A flat-fold mask supplied in bulk with no markings other the embossed KN95

495

label; this mask had negative filtration efficiency, and more particles were detected at the output of our test

496

apparatus than at the input (Figure 2, line 12). Additional photographs of mask are available in

497

Supplementary Material 2.

498

499

## **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS**

500

**Supplementary Material 1:** NIOSH infographic illustrating the correct labeling of N95 masks “NIOSH

501

Diagram.pdf”.

502

**Supplementary Material 2:** Photographs of masks undergoing filtration efficiency testing “Photographs of

503

masks tested.ppt”. Numbers on images correspond to number on Figure 2 and first column of

504

Supplementary Material 3.

505

**Supplementary Material 3:** Filtration efficiency raw data (depicted in Figure 2) “Filtration Efficiency

506

Data.csv”.