CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #:	2005
DateRun:	02/22/2005
Experimenters:	Jason Marshall
ClientType:	Cleaner Manufacturer
ProjectNumber:	Project #1
Substrates:	Textile
PartType:	Coupon
Contaminants:	Dirt
Cleaning Methods:	Manual Wipe
Analytical Methods:	Light Meter
Purpose:	To evaluate and compare product with industry standard for carpet cleaning.

Experimental Procedure:

The procedure followed is a modified version of the Institute of Inspection Cleaning and Restoration Certification (IICRC) Standard and Reference Guide S100. Much of the testing was modeled after Appendix D, IICRC Carpet Cleaning Methods Testing Protocol. The carpet substrate was donated by Shaw Industries of Dalton, GA. This carpet type is specifically designated in the IICRC Appendix method. An AATCC (Research Triangle Park, NC) soil was obtained from Textile Innovators, a division of SDL Atlas of Charlotte, NC, as suggested by DuPont Antron® of Kennesaw, GA.

Prior to soiling, a SPER Scientific Light Meter 840021 was used to measure Foot Candles from the surface of the carpet. Each carpet was marked-off into 6 sections measuring 3.5" (w) and 6" (l). (The carpeting was not cut into individual pieces as it would be too difficult to physically soil and clean smaller carpet sections.) Six readings were taken in each grid area to obtain baseline readings. Modifications to the above mentioned standard included: (1) omitting the use of milling stones and (2) replacing the Zytel® Type 6,6 nylon pellets with Nalgene® tubing cut into 1/8" pieces, or 'pellets'. According to the standard, approximately 1000 grams of pellets should be used for every 12 grams of soil. Or, 83 grams of pellets used per gram of soil. S100 also suggests using 500 grams of pellets for each soil under investigation (in this case, one) for carpet measuring 10.375" x 39.375" (408.5 sq. in.). This equals 1.22 (500/408.5 = 1.22) grams of pellets per square inch of carpet. Since the Lab had 174 grams of tubing/pellets at its disposal, two (2) grams of the AATCC soil were needed to artificially contaminate the carpet.

The carpet was cut into 7.375" x 19.6" (144.54 sq. in.) pieces. The carpet pieces were soiled by placing one piece of carpet into a 1-gallon can, making sure the carpet lined the inner wall of the can. The plastic-tubing pieces were poured into the bucket and the soil was distributed along the width of the can. The can was lidded and placed into a harness attached to a crank shaft. The crank was turned at an average rate of 42 rpm by hand for 5 minutes in one direction, followed by 5 minutes of rotation in the opposite direction. At the end of the 10-minute soiling regime, the carpet was placed onto a carpet template and vacuumed with a Eureka SuperBroom (Brush-Up, Motor-Driven/Brush-Roll) vacuum for 3 strokes in the forward direction followed by 3 strokes in the backward direction. The carpet pieces were evaluated again for Foot Candles.

The carpet sections were then cut down the middle, length-wise to allow carpet samples to fit into the Gardner Straight Line Washability Unit. Each piece was marked-off into three sections. Each section was sprayed 15 times with the heated (120 F) cleaning product and allowed to soak for 30 seconds. A Professional Painter's Rag was attached to the Unit's cleaning sled. The rag was also sprayed with the same cleaning product until the rag was saturated (approx. 15 sprays).
After soaking, the rag/sled was placed on one end of the carpet section and the Unit run for 91 cycles (approx. 2.5 minutes). Every 30 cycles, each section of carpet was sprayed 6 times with the cleaning solution. The carpet was removed from the Unit and allowed to dry. Figure 1 contains a representation of the Gardner Straightline Washability Unit. A third and final series of light meter readings were recorded for each cleaned section. Following the 2.5 minute cleaning process and analysis, a second 2.5 minute cleaning time was conducted. The rag/sled was placed on one end of the carpet section and the Unit run for 91 cycles (approx. 2.5 minutes). Every 30 cycles, each section of carpet was sprayed 6 times with the cleaning solution. The carpet was removed from the Unit and allowed to dry. The carpet was again analyzed using the light meter. Two dilutions were used: 1 oz/gal DFC 105 (128:1); 1 oz/5 gal Liquid 90 (640:1).

Results:

Initial light meter readings of pre-treated carpet samples were used as cleanliness baselines. The average 'soiled' readings were subtracted from the average initial readings to establish the degree of soiling for any particular carpet sample before cleaning. To determine the level of cleanliness achieved upon testing, the average soiled readings were subtracted from the average final (i.e., cleaned) readings taken after testing and divided by the average initial readings. Table 1 contains the results of the light meter readings for DFC 105 and Liquid Formula 90.

Table 1. 2.5 Minute Cleaning

DFC 105

	2.5 minutes

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

	Cleaner	Average Readings			Calculations		
	Un-soiled	Soiled	Cleaned	*Soiling	*Cleaning Differential (Dc)	Percent	Average Results
	(U)	(S)	(C)	Differential (Ds)	C-S	Change	
				U-S		Dcx100/ Ds	
Sample 1	10.45	2.44	3.43	8.02	1.00	12.46	
Sample 2	10.63	3.14	3.47	7.49	0.33	4.45	7.27
Sample 3	10.18	3.97	4.27	6.22	0.31	4.91	

Llq 90

	2.5 minutes						
	Cleaner	Average Readings			Calculations		
	Un-soiled	Soiled	Cleaned	*Soiling	*Cleaning Differential (Dc)	Percent	Average Results
	(U)	(S)	(C)	Differential (Ds)	C-S	Change	
				U-S		Dcx100/ Ds	
Sample 1	11.28	2.30	3.25	8.98	0.95	10.56	
Sample 2	11.09	3.18	3.44	7.91	0.26	3.33	7.01
Sample 3	10.54	3.61	4.11	6.93	0.50	7.14	

Table 2. Five Minute Cleaning

DFC 105

	Cleaner	Average Readings			Calculations		
	Un-soiled	Soiled	Cleaned	*Soiling	*Cleaning Differential (Dc)	Percent	Average Results
	(U)	(S)	(C)	Differential (Ds)	C-S	Change	
				U-S		Dcx100/ Ds	
Sample 1	10.45	2.44	4.25	8.02	1.81	22.60	
Sample 2	10.63	3.14	4.39	7.49	1.25	16.69	16.70
Sample 3	10.18	3.97	4.64	6.22	0.67	10.80	

Llq 90

	Cleaner	Average Readings			Calculations		
	Un-soiled	Soiled	Cleaned	*Soiling	*Cleaning Differential (Dc)	Percent	Average Results
	(U)	(S)	(C)	Differential (Ds)	C-S	Change	
				U-S		Dcx100/ Ds	
Sample 1	11.28	2.30	4.40	8.98	2.10	23.33	
Sample 2	11.09	3.18	4.31	7.91	1.14	14.35	18.75

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

Sample 3	10.54	3.61	4.90	6.93	1.29	18.58	

The DFC 105 performed better on average than the industry standard product (Liquid Formula 90) at the 2.5 minute cleaning interval. However, after the additional cleaning cycle, the industry standard product was slightly more effective than DFC 105.

Summary:

Substrates:	Textile
Contaminants:	Dirt

Company Name:	Product Name:	Conc.:	Efficiency:	Effective:	Observations:
Cogent Environmental Solutions	DFC 105	0.78	0.00	☑	
Chemspec	Liquid Formula 90	0.156	0.00	☑	

Conclusion:

No acceptable cut off point was established for soil removal in this carpet cleaning procedure. The two products (client and industry standard) had similar cleaning results.