CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #:	2008
DateRun:	11/23/2008
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 carpet resoiling characteristics of supplied cleaning product for GS 37 certification
Experimental Procedure:	Carpet pieces that were previously soiled and cleaned with the Super H2O2 (supplied product) and Liquid Formula 90 (industry standard product) were resoiled by placing the carpet sections into the 1-gallon can, making sure the carpet lined the inner wall of the can. Nalgene® tubing cut into 1/8" pieces were poured into the bucket and 2 grams of the AATCC 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 5 strokes in the forward direction followed by the same number of strokes in the backward direction. The carpet pieces were evaluated again using a SPER Scientific Light Meter 840021 used to measure Foot Candles from the surface of the carpet. Visual comparison was also preformed to determine which product looked cleaner.
Results:	The industry standard product resulted in slightly higher post vacuuming light meter readings. Visually, there was little difference between the two carpet sections after resoiling and vacuuming. The table lists the readings for each cleaner.

Cleanline Super H2O2

Cleanline Super H2O2				
Post Clean	Resoil	Vacuumed	Difference	
22.60	4.66	4.86	0.20	
22.20	4.11	4.40	0.29	
20.50	5.07	5.31	0.24	
29.00	3.00	3.22	0.22	
27.40	3.86	4.04	0.18	
29.60	3.85	4.03	0.18	
25.22	4.09	4.31	0.22	
20.20	5.55	5.78	0.23	
21.80	6.64	6.89	0.25	
21.80	5.91	6.13	0.22	
25.40	4.12	4.39	0.27	
29.30	4.08	4.27	0.19	
24.40	4.44	4.64	0.20	
23.82	5.12	5.35	0.23	
23.20	5.56	5.76	0.20	
22.00	4.87	5.11	0.24	
21.90	5.10	5.36	0.26	
19.30	3.33	3.57	0.24	
22.40	3.58	3.92	0.34	
24.20	3.77	3.96	0.19	Average
22.17	4.37	4.61	0.25	0.23
Liquid 90				
Post Clean	Resoil	Vacuumed	Difference	
15.90	10.20	10.52	0.32	

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

17.90	9.42	9.69	0.27	
17.60	10.11	10.34	0.23	
19.50	11.21	11.51	0.30	
20.80	14.78	15.10	0.32	
22.60	10.22	10.50	0.28	
19.05	10.99	11.28	0.29	
18.10	7.58	7.89	0.31	
19.50	9.01	9.24	0.23	
16.10	8.66	8.94	0.28	
17.70	9.35	9.66	0.31	
19.50	10.83	11.17	0.34	
22.20	8.75	8.98	0.23	
18.85	9.03	9.31	0.28	
18.90	10.41	10.61	0.20	
18.70	10.99	11.23	0.24	
18.00	10.47	10.68	0.21	
19.90	12.13	12.40	0.27	
22.20	12.64	12.90	0.26	
23.60	11.40	11.81	0.41	Average
20.22	11.34	11.61	0.27	0.28

Summary:

Substrates:	Textile				
Contaminants:	Dirt				
Company Name:	**Product Name:**	**Conc.:**	**Efficiency:**	**Effective:**	**Observations:**
Cleanline Products	H2O2 Super Citrus Concentrate	0.78	0.00	☑	
Chemspec	Liquid Formula 90	0.16	0.00	☑	

Conclusion: The supplied product resulted in a slightly lower resoiling resistance than the industry standard. Visual evaluation yielded comparable levels.