

# CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #: 2017

DateRun: 06/06/2017

Experimenters: George Liang, Vinh Tran, Hayley Byra

ClientType:

ProjectNumber: Project #1

Substrates: Glass/Quartz, Chrome

PartType: Coupon

Contaminants: Films, Soaps

Cleaning Methods: Manual Wipe

Analytical Methods: Gravimetric, Visual

Purpose: To evaluate supplied product for glass soil removal from glass and chrome surfaces.

Experimental Procedure: The following experimental procedure follows TURI's cleaning standard for SCL 2 glass soap scum.

Soiling Process:

Pre-weighed chrome and glass coupons were soiled with SSL Soil 2 glass soap scum using a hand held swab. The glass soap scum is made from a blend of water 51.5%, hair gel 25.6%, Toothpaste 10.4%, shaving cream 5.3%, hair spray 3.7% and spray deodorant 3.5%. The coupons were allowed to dry for 24 hours at room temperature before re-weighing for the amount of contaminated added onto the coupons.

Cleaning Process:

Three of the same type of coupons were placed into a Gardner Straight Line Washability unit. A Wypall X60 reinforced wipe was attached to the cleaning sled and soaked with 1 spray of cleaning solutions. Each coupon was sprayed once with the same cleaning solution. Each cleaning solutions were diluted to the suggested dilution provided by the vendor. The solution was allowed to penetrate for 30 seconds followed by cleaning in the SLW unit for 5 cycles (~10 seconds).

Efficacy Rating Process:

The coupons were left to sit at room temperature in time intervals of: 1 hour, 1 day after the cleaning process before re-weighing the coupons for the amount of contaminants removed. Three testers were used to do a visual ranking to measure the efficacy of the cleaning agents. The visual ranking of the cleaned substrates was in accordance to the following ratings:

Filming is best recognized as "haziness" or overall "milkyiness", while streaking is best identified as dried droplets or "spotting", usually found strung together into thin white lines. Each coupon was evaluated separately for filming and streaking, (i.e., product residues without added soil), according to a scale of "1" to "7" meaning;

Filming Streaking

7 = high filming 7 = high streaking poor (performance)

1 = no visible filming 1 = no visible streaking (excellent performance)

Results: Comparative Analysis

All efficacy rating mentioned in the following comparative analysis is from the overnight sit drying time, because there was no significant increase in glass soap scum removal between the 1 hour drying time and from the overnight sit.

The sample cleaner: SWR One had a similar efficacy rating as the comparative cleaner: Suma Break-Up HD Degreaser when removing glass soap scum from glass coupon; with respective efficacy ratings of: 96.84% and 95.04%. Similarly, the filming on the glass coupons were observed to not be significantly greater than the comparative cleaner; with respective filming ratings of 4.0 in comparison to 3.7. However, the sampled was observed to be slightly more effective than the comparative cleaner in terms of the visual streaking rating; with respective streaking ratings of 4.6 as opposed to 5.5.

Furthermore, the sample cleaner was just as effective as the comparative cleaner in cleaning glass soap scum from chrome plated aluminum coupons; with respective efficacy ratings of 95.19% and 95.04%. Whereas, the sampled cleaner had a similar rating as the comparative cleaner; with respective film ratings of 2.6 and 2.9. Similarly, the visual streaking for the sampled cleaner was observed to be slightly better than the comparative cleaner; with respective streak ratings of 2.9 and 3.3.

Table pertaining to the amount of contaminant added and removed using a gravimetric scale to measure the efficacy of the respective cleaners.

Gravimetric Result: After Time Interval: 1 hour

Cleaner	Initial wt. of cont. (g)	Final wt. of cont. (g)	Cont. Removed (g)	Avg. Cont. Removed (%)

## CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SWR One_Glass	0.0580	0.0020	96.55	95.80
	0.0581	0.0025	95.70	
	0.0578	0.0028	95.16	
SWR One_Chrome Plated Aluminum	0.0618	0.0027	95.63	94.48
	0.0607	0.0036	94.07	
	0.0606	0.0038	93.73	
Suma Break-Up HD Degreaser_Glass	0.0600	0.0037	93.83	94.65
	0.0610	0.0027	95.57	
	0.0606	0.0033	94.55	
Suma Break-Up HD Degreaser_Chrome Plated Aluminum	0.0611	0.0043	92.96	93.88
	0.0592	0.0031	94.76	
	0.0625	0.0038	93.92	

Gravimetric Result: After Time Interval: 24 hour

Cleaner	Initial wt. of cont. (g)	Final wt. of cont. (g)	Cont. Removed (g)	Avg. Cont. Removed (%)
SWR One_Glass	0.0580	0.0018	96.90	96.84
	0.0581	0.0017	97.07	
	0.0578	0.0020	96.54	
SWR One_Chrome Plated Aluminum	0.0618	0.0026	95.79	95.19
	0.0607	0.0032	94.73	
	0.0606	0.0030	95.05	
Suma Break-Up HD Degreaser_Glass	0.0600	0.0036	94.00	95.04
	0.0610	0.0027	95.57	
	0.0606	0.0027	95.54	
Suma Break-Up HD Degreaser_Chrome Plated Aluminum	0.0611	0.0040	93.45	95.04
	0.0592	0.0021	96.45	
	0.0625	0.0030	95.20	

Filming Visual Results: Table pertaining to visual haziness or milkiness ranking from respective cleaning agents.

Cleaner	Filming (1)	Filming (2)	Filming (3)	Avg. Filming
SWR One_Glass	6.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
	1.5	2.5	6.0	
	1.5	3.5	6.0	
SWR One_Chrome Plated Aluminum	1.0	2.0	6.0	2.6
	1.0	1.0	5.0	
	1.0	1.5	5.0	
Suma Break-Up HD Degreaser_Glass	6.0	1.5	5.0	3.7
	2.0	2.0	6.0	
	1.5	2.0	7.0	
Suma Break-Up HD Degreaser_Chrome Plated Aluminum	2.0	1.5	6.0	2.9
	1.0	1.5	6.0	
	1.0	1.0	6.0	

Streaking Visual Results: Table pertaining to visual dried droplets or "spotting", usually found strung together into thin white lines ranking from respective cleaning agents.

Cleaner	Spotting (1)	Spotting (2)	Spotting (3)	Avg. Spotting
SWR One_Glass	5.0	2.0	4.0	4.6
	6.0	3.0	6.5	

## CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

	5.0	3.5	6.5	
SWR One_Chrome Plated Aluminum	1.0	1.5	5.0	2.9
	1.0	1.0	6.5	
	1.5	1.5	7.0	
Suma Break-Up HD Degreaser_Glass	5.0	2.5	6.0	5.5
	6.0	5.0	7.0	
	6.0	6.0	6.0	
Suma Break-Up HD Degreaser_Chrome Plated Aluminum	1.5	1.5	5.0	3.3
	2.0	1.5	7.0	
	2.0	2.0	7.0	

Summary:

<b>Substrates:</b>	Glass/Quartz, Chrome				
<b>Contaminants:</b>	Films, Soaps				
<b>Company Name:</b>	<b>Product Name:</b>	<b>Conc.:</b>	<b>Efficiency:</b>	<b>Effective:</b>	<b>Observations:</b>
SWR Corporation	SWR One	10	96.02	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	F - 3.3; S 3.8
Diversey Corporation	Suma Break-Up HD Degreaser	5	95.04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	F - 3.34; S 4.4

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the sampled cleaner: SWR One is just as effective as the comparative cleaner: Suma Break-Up HD Degreaser.