CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #:	2014
DateRun:	06/22/2014
Experimenters:	Jonathan Oljey, George Liang
ClientType:	Cleaner Manufacturer
ProjectNumber:	Project #1
Substrates:	Textile
PartType:	Coupon
Contaminants:	Dirt
Cleaning Methods:	Manual Wipe
Analytical Methods:	Gloss-Color Meter
Purpose:	To evaluate supplied product for carpet cleaning as compared to an industry standard product.

Experimental Procedure:

The procedure followed is a modified version of the Institute of Inspection Cleaning and Restoration Certification (IICRC) Standard and Reference Guide S100. Much of the testing was modeled after Appendix D, IICRC Carpet Cleaning Methods Testing Protocol. The carpet substrate was donated by Shaw Industries of Dalton, GA.

This carpet type is specifically designated in the IICRC Appendix method. An AATCC (Research Triangle Park, NC) soil was obtained from Textile Innovators, a division of SDL Atlas of Charlotte, NC, as suggested by DuPont Antron of Kennesaw, GA.
Prior to soiling, a BYK spectro-guide color/gloss meter was used to establish a baseline L-value from the surface of the carpet. Each carpet was marked-off into 6 sections measuring 3.5 in wide and 6 in long. (The carpeting was not cut into individual pieces as it would be too difficult to physically soil and clean smaller carpet sections.)

Six readings were taken in each grid area to obtain baseline readings.

Modifications to the above-mentioned standard included: (1) omitting the use of milling stones and (2) replacing the Zytel Type 6,6 nylon pellets with Nalgene tubing cut into 1/8 inch pieces, or ‘pellets’. According to the standard, approximately 1000 grams of pellets should be used for every 12 grams of soil or, 83 grams of pellets used per gram of soil. S100 also suggests using 500 grams of pellets for each soil under investigation (in this case, one) for carpet measuring 10.375 inch x 39.375 inch (408.5 sq. in.). This equals 1.22 (500/408.5 = 1.22) grams of pellets per square inch of carpet. Since the Lab had 174 grams of tubing/ pellets at its disposal, two grams of the AATCC soil were needed to artificially contaminate the carpet.

The carpet was cut into 7.375 inch x 19.6 inch (144.54 sq. in.) pieces. The carpet pieces were soiled by placing one piece of carpet into a 1-gallon can, making sure the carpet lined the inner wall of the can. The plastic-tubing pieces were poured into the bucket and the 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 vacuum cleaner for 3 strokes in the forward direction followed by 3 strokes in the backward direction. The carpet pieces were evaluated again for L-value levels.

The carpet sections were then cut down the middle, lengthwise to allow carpet samples to fit into the Gardner Straight Line Washability Unit. Each piece was marked-off into three sections. Each section was sprayed 15 times with the cleaning product and allowed to soak for 30 seconds. A Kimberly-Clark Wypall reinforced paper towel was attached to the cleaning sled. The towel was also sprayed with the same cleaning product until the towel was saturated (approx. 15 sprays). After soaking, the towel/sled was placed on one end of the carpet section and the Unit run for 91 cycles (approx. 2.5 minutes). Every 30 cycles, each section of carpet was sprayed 6 times with the cleaning solution. The carpet was removed from the Unit and allowed to dry overnight. A third and final series of color meter readings were recorded for each cleaned section.

Chemistries Evaluated: Resolve; SRC;

Results:

To effectively compare the cleaners, we determined the % of the gloss remaining for each carpet. This was done by taking the initial, dirty, and clean readings for the carpet. The dirty and clean readings were then divided by the initial readings to determine a % restoration to the initial.

	Initial	Dirty	R1 Final	R2 Final			
	L	L	L	L	Dirty	Clean	Resoil
Resolve	69.37	40.55	46.21	37.75	58.45	66.61	54.42
Resolve	68.2	42.82	44.61	39.97	62.79	65.41	58.61
Resolve	68.38	41.02	44.54	37.8	59.99	65.14	55.28

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

Resolve	69.3	42.48	50.35	39.01	61.30	72.66	56.29
Resolve	69.52	45.29	45.91	39.06	65.15	66.04	56.19
Resolve	67.21	42.64	45.41	37.03	63.44	67.56	55.10
BrandBuzz	70.37	47.63	49.93	49.57	67.69	70.95	70.44
BrandBuzz	69.85	44.48	43.75	47.57	63.68	62.63	68.10
BrandBuzz	67.89	45.44	45.95	48.39	66.93	67.68	71.28
BrandBuzz	67.41	43.62	46.9	37.59	64.71	69.57	55.76
BrandBuzz	65.64	40.51	56.39	51.72	61.72	85.91	78.79
BrandBuzz	66.76	43.62	53.02	49.21	65.34	79.42	73.71

Average

Cleaner	Clean Ave	Resoil Ave
Resolve	67.24	55.98
SRC	72.7	69.68

Summary:

Substrates:	Textile				
Contaminants:	Dirt				
Company Name:	**Product Name:**	**Conc.:**	**Efficiency:**	**Effective:**	**Observations:**
Brand Buzz	SR# 14-100C	100	72.70	☑	
Reckitt Benckiser	Resolve High Traffic Foam Carpet Cleaner	100	67.24	☐	

Conclusion:

The SRC product supplied by Branbuzz was far more efficient than the Resolve brand cleaner, resulting in a 72% restoration to the original, compared to then 67% supplied by Resolve. This high level of cleaning was shown again with the resoiling, which resulted in 70% restoration to the original while the Resolve only restored to 56%.