CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #: 2013

DateRun: 07/29/2013

Experimenters: Junhee Cho, Loc Nguyen, Jonathan Oljey, Eyob Befekadu

ClientType: Cleaning Equipment Mfr

ProjectNumber: Project #1

Substrates: Vinyl Composite Tiles

PartType: Coupon

Contaminants: Dirt

Cleaning Methods: Mechanical Agitation

Analytical Methods: Visual, Timing

Purpose: To evaluate supplied products for floor cleaning

Experimental Procedure: Initial testing was conducted using 120 grams of sand. The soil was spread across 40 square feet of floor tile (3 grams per tile). The mop was soaked and wringed for 10 seconds each. The Qleeno was operated on lowest water output and highest water suction. The remaining soil was then collected and weighed.

Methods Evaluated: Manual Mop; Qleeno

Results: The dry time for the Qleeno floor testing was approx. 5 minutes, while the dry time for the mop was approx. 1 hour. Visually, the Qleeno looked much cleaner than the mopping, as mopping left behind large spots of soil.

Cleaner	Initial wt	Final wt	% Removed	Set Up time (sec)	Run Time (sec)	Total Time (sec)	Average Efficency	Average Time(sec)
Mop	119.8890	39.2936	67.23	148.0000	60.00	208.00	57.65	201.67
	120.1668	55.6345	53.70	145.0000	53.00	198.00		
	119.4796	57.3252	52.02	143.0000	56.00	199.00		
Qleeno	120.8929	49.0743	59.41	107.00	65.00	172.00	58.67	174.33
	120.8929	39.7489	67.12	99.00	66.00	165.00		
	120.6282	60.9232	49.50	116.00	70.00	186.00		

Summary:

Substrates:	Vinyl Composite Tiles				
Contaminants:	Dirt				
Company Name:	**Product Name:**	**Conc.:**	**Efficiency:**	**Effective:**	**Observations:**
Water	Water	100	57.60	☐	Mop - Ave time 201.7
Water	Water	100	58.70	☐	Mop - Ave time 174.3

Conclusion: Both methods worked with essentially the same efficiency. The set-up time was faster with the Qleeno system.