

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #:	2006																																								
DateRun:	03/30/2006																																								
Experimenters:	Jason Marshall																																								
ClientType:	Cleaner Manufacturer																																								
ProjectNumber:	Project #1																																								
Substrates:	Ceramics, Fiberglass, Chrome																																								
PartType:	Coupon																																								
Contaminants:	Soaps																																								
Cleaning Methods:	Manual Wipe																																								
Analytical Methods:	Gravimetric																																								
Purpose:	To reevaluate supplied product at higher concentration for bathroom cleaning.																																								
Experimental Procedure:	<p>The supplied cleaning product was diluted to the vendor's new recommended concentrations for bathroom cleaning using DI water (3.125%). Three 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 hand held swab and allowed to dry for 24 hours at room temperature. The contaminated coupons were weighed again to determine the amount of soil added.</p> <p>Three coupons were placed into a Gardner Straight Line Washability unit. A Professional Painter's Rag 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.</p>																																								
Results:	<p>The product was effective on two of three substrates. The fiberglass cleaning was just under the 85% cut off. However, the overall performance was considered acceptable removing just under 90%. The table below list the amount of soil added, the amount reaming and the efficiency for each substrate.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Cleaner</th> <th>Initial wt</th> <th>Final wt</th> <th>% Removed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ceramic</td> <td>0.3716</td> <td>0.0109</td> <td>97.07</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>0.5033</td> <td>0.0186</td> <td>96.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>0.4951</td> <td>0.0387</td> <td>92.18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fiberglass</td> <td>0.4254</td> <td>0.0738</td> <td>82.65</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>0.5608</td> <td>0.1127</td> <td>79.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>0.5124</td> <td>0.0553</td> <td>89.21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chrome</td> <td>0.3293</td> <td>0.0193</td> <td>94.14</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>0.2221</td> <td>0.0277</td> <td>87.53</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>0.4056</td> <td>0.0428</td> <td>89.45</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Cleaner	Initial wt	Final wt	% Removed	Ceramic	0.3716	0.0109	97.07		0.5033	0.0186	96.30		0.4951	0.0387	92.18	Fiberglass	0.4254	0.0738	82.65		0.5608	0.1127	79.90		0.5124	0.0553	89.21	Chrome	0.3293	0.0193	94.14		0.2221	0.0277	87.53		0.4056	0.0428	89.45
Cleaner	Initial wt	Final wt	% Removed																																						
Ceramic	0.3716	0.0109	97.07																																						
	0.5033	0.0186	96.30																																						
	0.4951	0.0387	92.18																																						
Fiberglass	0.4254	0.0738	82.65																																						
	0.5608	0.1127	79.90																																						
	0.5124	0.0553	89.21																																						
Chrome	0.3293	0.0193	94.14																																						
	0.2221	0.0277	87.53																																						
	0.4056	0.0428	89.45																																						
Summary:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Substrates:</td> <td colspan="5">Ceramics, Fiberglass, Chrome</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contaminants:</td> <td colspan="5">Soaps</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Company Name:</td> <td>Product Name:</td> <td>Conc.:</td> <td>Efficiency:</td> <td>Effective:</td> <td>Observations:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Perma Inc</td> <td>Easy Mix Foaming Restroom Cleaner #1040</td> <td>3.125</td> <td>89.83</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Substrates:	Ceramics, Fiberglass, Chrome					Contaminants:	Soaps					Company Name:	Product Name:	Conc.:	Efficiency:	Effective:	Observations:	Perma Inc	Easy Mix Foaming Restroom Cleaner #1040	3.125	89.83	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																	
Substrates:	Ceramics, Fiberglass, Chrome																																								
Contaminants:	Soaps																																								
Company Name:	Product Name:	Conc.:	Efficiency:	Effective:	Observations:																																				
Perma Inc	Easy Mix Foaming Restroom Cleaner #1040	3.125	89.83	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																																					
Conclusion:	The Perma Easy Mix Foaming Restroom Cleaner 1040 overall cleaning average was over the 85% cut off when used at the higher concentration.																																								