

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #: 2025
 DateRun: 07/08/2025
 Experimenters: Tatyanna Moreland Junior
 ClientType: Community Group
 ProjectNumber: Project #2
 Substrates: Glass/Quartz, Mirror
 PartType: Coupon
 Contaminants: SSL Soil 2 Glass Soap Scum
 Cleaning Methods: Manual Wipe
 Analytical Methods: Gravimetric, Visual

Purpose: To test the efficiency of BWG Amazing Glass Cleaner against Windex at removing Glass Soap Scum Soil from various substrates.

Experimental Procedure: Twelve pre-weighed coupons, six per substrate per cleaner, were contaminated with 0.5 g of Glass Soap Scum Soil composed of (INSERT INGREDIENTS). Coupons dried at room temperature (68°F) for 24 hours before their dirty weights were recorded. Three coupons of the same substrate were placed in a Single Line Washing Unit (SLW) with a Wypall X60 wipe attached to the cleaning sled. The wipe and coupons were sprayed two times with the cleaner and soaked for 10 seconds. The SLW was then run for 20 cleaning cycles (30 seconds of manual cleaning). Coupons dried overnight at room temperature before final weights were recorded.

Results:

Substrate	Cleaner	Coupon #	Initial wt.	Cont. wt.	Clean wt.	Initial wt of cont.	Final wt of cont.	%Cont Removed	Average % Removal	Average Cleaner %
Mirror	BWG Amazing	21	37.0458	37.1381	37.0816	0.0923	0.0358	61.21	70.87	80.38
		4	37.3081	37.4149	37.3367	0.1068	0.0286	73.22		
		10	37.4129	37.5274	37.4379	0.1145	0.025	78.17		
	Windex	9	37.6894	37.7851	37.6983	0.0957	0.0089	90.70	89.90	
		15	37.3152	37.4127	37.3266	0.0975	0.0114	88.31		
		6	37.9143	38.013	37.9235	0.0987	0.0092	90.68		
Glass	BWG Amazing	45	37.4369	37.5238	37.4472	0.0869	0.0103	88.15	87.58	90.12
		35	37.7007	37.8205	37.7174	0.1198	0.0167	86.06		
		41	37.6404	37.746	37.6525	0.1056	0.0121	88.54		
	Windex	15	37.5616	37.6676	37.5759	0.106	0.0143	86.51	92.65	
		14	37.7987	37.9048	37.8034	0.1061	0.0047	95.57		
		7	37.6119	37.7161	37.6162	0.1042	0.0043	95.87		

Rating	Cleanliness
1	No Visible Filming/ Streaking (Excellent Performance)
2	Minimal Filming/ Streaking
3	Slight Filming/ Streaking
4	Noticeable Filming/ Streaking
5	Considerable Filming/ Streaking
6	Severe Filming/ Streaking
7	High Filming/ Streaking (Poor Performance)

			Cleanliness	
--	--	--	-------------	--

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

Cleaner	Substrate	Coupon	1	2	3	Average	Product Avg
BWG Amazing	Mirror	21	6	5.5	6	5.06	4.20
		4	5	5	5		
		10	4	5	4		
	Glass	9	3.5	4.5	4	4.06	
		15	3.5	5	4		
		6	3	5	4		
Windex	Mirror	45	3	3	4	3.50	3.00
		35	4	3.5	4.5		
		41	3.5	3	3		
	Glass	15	4	3.5	5	3.00	
		14	3.5	2	2		
		7	3	2	2		
Filming							
Cleaner		Coupon	1	2	3	Average	Product Avg
BWG Amazing	Mirror	21	6	6	6	6.00	5.59
		4	6	6	6		
		10	6	6	6		
	Glass	9	6	6	6	6.22	
		15	6	7	6		
		6	6	7	6		
Windex	Mirror	45	5	4	5	4.56	4.61
		35	4	5	5		
		41	4	4	5		
	Glass	15	3	6	6	4.61	
		14	3	5	5		
		7	3.5	6	4		
Streaking							
Cleaner	Substrate	Coupon	1	2	3	Average	Product Avg
BWG Amazing	Mirror	21	7	6.5	6	6.28	6.20
		4	7	5	6		
		10	7	6	6		
	Glass	9	7	6	6	6.56	
		15	7	7	6		
		6	7	7	6		
Windex	Mirror	45	7	6	5	5.78	6.56
		35	7	5	5		
		41	7	5	5		
	Glass	15	7	6	6	6.56	
		14	7	7	6		
		7	7	7	6		

Summary:

Substrates:	Glass/Quartz, Mirror				
Contaminants:	SSL Soil 2 Glass Soap Scum				
Company Name:	Product Name:	Conc.:	Efficiency:	Effective:	Observations:
SC Johnson & Son Inc	Windex Glass & More Cleaner (Spray)	100%	91.28	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Brazilian Womens Group	Amazing Glass Cleaner	100	79.23	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Conclusion:

Windex was more effective than BWG Amazing Glass Cleaner on mirror and glass. Windex had better average product ratings for efficacy in both cleanliness and filming. BWG had a better average product rating for efficacy in streaking only.