

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #: 2008

DateRun: 08/11/2008

Experimenters: Jason Marshall, Shweta Bansal

ClientType: Cleaner Manufacturer

ProjectNumber: Project #1

Substrates: Ceramics, Fiberglass, Chrome

PartType: Coupon

Contaminants: Films, Soaps

Cleaning Methods: Manual Wipe

Analytical Methods: Gravimetric

Purpose: To evaluate supplied products for bathroom cleaning following GS 8 and 37 guidelines.

Experimental Procedure: The three supplied cleaning products were used at full strength and a fourth industry standard product was diluted to vendor recommended concentration for all purpose cleaning (12.5%).

Preweighed fiberglass, ceramic, and chrome coupons were coated with SSL Soil 1 (Bathroom soap scum: Vaseline Dry Skin Lotion 21.4%, Dial Clean Rinsing Body Wash 14.3%, Market Basket Shampoo & Conditioner (Pert)28.6%, Soft Soap Natural Liquid hand soap 21.4%, Coast Deodorant bar soap 7.2% and Water 7.1%) using a handheld swab and allowed to dry for 24 hours at room temperature. The contaminated coupons were weighed again to determine the amount of soil added.

Three coupons were placed into a Gardner Straight Line Washability unit. A Kimberly-Clark Wypal reinforced paper towel was attached to the cleaning sled and soaked with 5-7 sprays of cleaning solutions. Each coupon was sprayed 7-10 times with the same cleaning solution. The cleaning unit was run for 20 cycles (~33 seconds). At the end of the cleaning, coupons were wiped once with a dry paper towel. Final weights were recorded, efficiencies were calculated and recorded.

Results: All three supplied products removed more than 85% of the bathroom soap scum/film using manual wiping. All three products performed comparably to the selected industry standard product. The table lists the substrate cleaned, the amount of soil added, the amount remaining and the efficiency for each coupon cleaned.

Cleaner/Substrate

Cleaner	Initial wt	Final wt	% Removed
Janitors Ceramic	0.1303	0.0213	83.65
	0.1295	0.0292	77.45
	0.1424	0.0087	93.89
Heavy Ceramic	0.1013	0.0085	91.61
	0.0681	0.0058	91.48
	0.0846	0.0103	87.83
CleanGreen Ceramic	0.1379	0.0094	93.18
	0.1144	0.0070	93.88
	0.1401	0.0081	94.22
Washroom Ceramic	0.0604	0.0045	92.55
	0.0381	0.0018	95.28
	0.0607	0.0068	88.80
Janitors Chrome	0.0580	0.0032	94.48
	0.0728	0.0026	96.43
	0.0681	0.0036	94.71
Heavy Chrome	0.0632	0.0037	94.15
	0.0517	0.0037	92.84
	0.0457	0.0061	86.65
CleanGreen Chrome	0.0862	0.0074	91.42
	0.0594	0.0065	89.06
	0.0864	0.0046	94.68
Washroom Chrome	0.0709	0.0085	88.01

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

	0.0662	0.0103	84.44
	0.0590	0.0078	86.78
Janitors Fiberglass	0.1795	0.0196	89.08
	0.1798	0.0324	81.98
	0.1607	0.0203	87.37
Heavy Fiberglass	0.1600	0.0237	85.19
	0.2506	0.0254	89.86
	0.0849	0.0185	78.21
CleanGreen fiberglass	0.1192	0.0210	82.38
	0.1318	0.0360	72.69
	0.1871	0.0316	83.11
Washroom fiberglass	0.1114	0.0249	77.65
	0.1675	0.0239	85.73
	0.1530	0.0222	85.49

Summary:

Substrates:	Ceramics, Fiberglass, Chrome				
Contaminants:	Films, Soaps				
Company Name:	Product Name:	Conc.:	Efficiency:	Effective:	Observations:
Environmental Care and Share	Janitors Answer	100	88.78	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental Care and Share	Heavy Duty Cleaner Answer	100	88.65	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental Care and Share	Clean-N-Green	100	88.29	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Rochester Midland Corporation	Washroom Cleaner	12.5	87.19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Conclusion:

All three submitted products had overall average efficiencies greater than 85% and would be considered effective based on the SSL testing methodology.