

# CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #: 2002  
 DateRun: 04/03/2002  
 Experimenters: Jason Marshall  
 ClientType: Cleaning Equipment Mfr  
 ProjectNumber: Project #2  
 Substrates: Stainless Steel  
 PartType: Coupon  
 Contaminants: Coatings, Cutting/Tapping Fluids, Lubricating/Lapping Oils, Oil  
 Cleaning Methods: Ultrasonics  
 Analytical Methods:  
 Purpose: 2nd contaminant cleaning

**Experimental Procedure:** Eighteen preweighed coupons were coated with The Valvoline Co, Tectyl 505 (8052-41-3) rust preventative, using a hand held swab. Coupons were reweighed. Nine coupons were clipped to wire racks and immersed into the Flow-Matic machine and cleaned for 1 minutes using ultrasonics at 92 F, removed and rinsed in a tap water spray and re-immersed into the ultrasonics for an additional 1 minute followed by a second 5 second rinse. The nine coupons were then dried using an air knife for 15 seconds and then using a Master Appliance heat gun at 500 F for 15 seconds. The second set of nine coupons followed the same cleaning cycle except they were hung on a wire stand and immersed into a Crest 40 kHz ultrasonic tank.

**Results:** Comparison of the two processes revealed that the Flow-Matic system was more effective than the traditional ultrasonic equipment. The following table lists the results obtained during the evaluation.

Table 1. Cleaning Efficiencies

Process	Flow-Matic	Traditional
	99.93	99.46
	99.93	98.41
	98.97	98.90
	99.53	98.94
	99.95	96.30
	100.04	97.40
	99.24	97.45
	100.12	98.71
	100.06	99.51
Average	99.75	98.34
Std Dev	0.41	1.08

**Summary:**

<b>Substrates:</b>		Stainless Steel			
<b>Contaminants:</b>		Coatings, Cutting/Tapping Fluids, Lubricating/Lapping Oils, Oil			
<b>Company Name:</b>	<b>Product Name:</b>	<b>Conc.:</b>	<b>Efficiency:</b>	<b>Effective:</b>	<b>Observations:</b>
Water	Water	100	98.34	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Traditional system
Water	Water	100	99.75	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Flow-Matic system

**Conclusion:** The Flow-Matic system was more effective than the traditional ultrasonic method.