



## Supplementary Materials



**Figure S1. Different Donning Styles with the Ultra Fit Mask for Improved Fitting.**

(A) C-shaped: C-shaped curve on the side edges with pinching the chin edge. (B) V-shaped: pinching the side wires resembling a V. Optional chin pinching may further tighten fitting depending on the user's preferences. (C) L-shaped: folding the lower parts of the side wires resembling an L. Optional chin pinching may further tighten fitting depending on user's preferences.



**Figure S2. Three Different Face Masks (3PM, KF94, UFM) Used for Quantitative Fit Test Donned on a ISO 16976-2 Medium Headform.**

(A) 3PM. Large gaps on the cheek sides are clearly visible. (B) KF94. Side gaps are visible. Infraorbital-nasal region and the chin appear closed. (C) UFM. The mask showed reduced side gaps and was tucked under the chin by pinched chin wire.

Figure S1.mp4



**Movie S1. Movie of 3-ply Mask and Ultra Fit Mask.**

Masks on a rotating turntable. Differences in structural rigidity are clearly visible.

Figure S3.mp4

**Movie S2. Movie of Exhaled Vapor Tracking of the Front and Side views.**

*NOTE: Per medRxiv policy that manuscripts not contain 'photographs/videos and any other identifying information of people' we have removed movie S2 to comply with this policy. In the this items, an author of this manuscript can be seen wearing the mask as part of testing. The full figure is available upon request to the corresponding author or via the following link.*

[https://www.dropbox.com/sh/nkg2k1gu4aih3wz/AADy\\_o3CqlovLpCuXTE44uCYa?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/nkg2k1gu4aih3wz/AADy_o3CqlovLpCuXTE44uCYa?dl=0)

Figure S4.mp4

**Movie S3. Infrared thermal imaging movie with 3-ply mask and Ultra Fit mask.**

*NOTE: Per medRxiv policy that manuscripts not contain 'photographs/videos and any other identifying information of people' we have removed movie S2 to comply with this policy. In the this items, an author of this manuscript can be seen wearing the mask as part of testing. The full figure is available upon request to the corresponding author or via the following link.*

[https://www.dropbox.com/sh/nkg2k1gu4aih3wz/AADy\\_o3CqlovLpCuXTE44uCYa?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/nkg2k1gu4aih3wz/AADy_o3CqlovLpCuXTE44uCYa?dl=0)

**Table S1: Value Comparison**

	<b>Ultra Fit Mask</b>	<b>Conventional Mask</b> (e.g cloth masks, 3-ply masks, KF94)	<b>Clinical Grade Respirators</b> (e.g N95, KN95, FFP3)	<b>Alternative Solutions</b> (e.g mask fitter, double-masking, knotting)
<b>Total Inward Leakage (excluding filter penetration leakage)</b>	~8%	20-40% (1,2)	< 1% (if fit test passed) If fit test failed, 4% (3)	Can achieve < 1% in conjunction with disposable mask (4)
<b>Filtration<sup>a</sup></b>	88% (at 10cm/s), > 95% (at 85 lpm) NIOSH test method	25-80% (5), specified at 95% <sup>b</sup>	> 95% (at 85 lpm) NIOSH test method	N/A
<b>Fit (Fit Factor, FF)</b>	12.9 (n=13)	2.6 - 4.4 (1,2)	>100 (if passed a fit test) < 25 (if failed a fit test)	Help achieving mask FF >100 (4)
<b>Breathing Resistance</b>	6.1 mmH <sub>2</sub> O (at 10cm/s) 5.1 mmH <sub>2</sub> O (at 85 lpm)	varies (4-27 mmH <sub>2</sub> O) <sup>c</sup>	<35 mm H <sub>2</sub> O column (at 85 lpm)	High/Medium
<b>Comfort</b>	Good	Good	Poor	Medium or Poor
<b>Accessibility to public</b>	Good	Good	Poor	Good
<b>Manufacturing at scale</b>	Good	Good/Poor	Intermediate	Good or N/A
<b>Cost</b>	Low (~\$0.50, \$0.05 addition to base mask price)	High for cloth mask (>\$0.50) Medium for KF94 (~\$0.50) Low for 3-ply mask (<\$0.50)	High (>\$1.00)	High (>\$1.00)
<b>Easiness-to-use</b>	Good	Good	Intermediate	Intermediate
<b>Washability/Resuability</b>	Yes	Cloth: Yes Non-cloth: No	Yes (6)	Depends

<b>Contact Dermatitis Risk</b>	No	No	Yes (7,8)	No
<b>Applicable Standards/Certification</b>	ASTM F3502 Level 2 for both filtration & breathability. NIOSH Workplace Performance Plus mask	Foreign standards e.g GB/T 32610-2016, YY/T 0969-2013, GB2626-2006, KF94, AFNOR SPEC S76-001	Surgical N95 designation	N/A

<sup>a</sup>NIOSH TEB-APR-STP-0059, “Determination of Particulate Filter Efficiency Level for N95 Series Filters Against Solid Particulates for Non-Powered, Air-Purifying Respirators Standard Test Procedure (STP)”

<sup>b</sup>Bacterial filtration efficiency per ASTM F2101 or equivalent foreign standards

<sup>c</sup>observed by the authors using TSI 8130 and NIOSH TEB-APR-STP-0059.

### **Supplemental References**

1. R. B. Lawrence, M. G. Duling, C. A. Calvert, C. C. Coffey, Comparison of performance of three different types of respiratory protection devices. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* 3, 465–474 (2006).
2. T. Oberg, L. M. Brosseau, Surgical mask filter and fit performance. *Am. J. Infect. Control.* 36, 276–282 (2008).
3. C. Ciotti, G. Pellissier, C. Rabaud, J. C. Lucet, D. Abiteboul, E. Bouvet, Effectiveness of respirator masks for healthcare workers, in France. *Med. Mal. Infect.* 42, 264–269 (2012).
4. Fix The Mask Data —the Essential Mask Brace | by Fix The Mask — the technical. | Medium, (available at <https://fixthemask.medium.com/fix-the-mask-data-the-essential-mask-brace-ad5bdf33f506>).
5. P. W. Clapp, E. E. Sickbert-Bennett, J. M. Samet, J. Berntsen, K. L. Zeman, D. J. Anderson, D. J. Weber, W. D. Bennett, Evaluation of cloth masks and modified procedure masks as personal protective equipment for the public during the COVID-19 pandemic.
6. N95DECON, N95 Decontamination & Reuse Method Decision Matrix (2020).
7. J. Yu, J. K. Chen, C. M. Mowad, M. Reeder, S. Hylwa, S. Chisolm, C. A. Dunnick, A. M. Goldminz, S. E. Jacob, P. A. Wu, J. Zippin, A. R. Atwater, Occupational dermatitis to facial personal protective equipment in health care workers: A systematic review. *J. Am. Acad. Dermatol.* 84, 486–494 (2021).
8. A. Hornbeck, J. K. Cichowicz, S. Kilinc-Balci, D. Rottach, J. Pollard, H. Boyles, Skin Irritation from Prolonged Use of Tight-Fitting Respirators | Blogs | CDC (2020), (available at <https://blogs.cdc.gov/niosh-science-blog/2020/08/04/skin-irritation-respirators/>).