

1 **3D Printed frames to enable reuse and improve the fit of N95 and KN95 respirators**

2

3 Malia McAvoy^{1,2*}, Ai-Tram N. Bui^{1,3*}, Christopher Hansen^{1,4*}, Deborah Plana^{1,2,5*}, Jordan T. Said^{1,3}, Zizi Yu^{1,3},
4 Helen Yang^{1,6}, Jacob Freake^{1,7}, Christopher Van^{1,8}, David Krikorian^{1,9}, Avilash Cramer^{1,2}, Leanne Smith^{1,8}, Liwei
5 Jiang^{1,10}, Karen J. Lee¹¹, Sara J. Li¹¹, Brandon Beller^{1,12}, Michael Short^{1,13}, Sherry H. Yu^{1,14}, Arash
6 Mostaghimi^{1,3,11}, Peter K. Sorger^{1,5,15†}, and Nicole R. LeBoeuf^{1,3,9,11†}

7

8

9 Affiliations:

10 ¹Greater Boston Pandemic Fabrication Team (PanFab) c/o Harvard-MIT Center for Regulatory Science,
11 Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

12 ²Harvard-MIT Division of Health Sciences and Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA

13 ³Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

14 ⁴Harvard Graduate School of Design, Cambridge, MA, USA

15 ⁵Harvard Ludwig Cancer Research Center and Department of Systems Biology, Harvard Medical School, Boston,
16 MA, USA

17 ⁶Harvard-MIT Center for Regulatory Science, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

18 ⁷Fikst Product Development, Woburn, MA, USA

19 ⁸Borobot, Middleborough, MA, USA

20 ⁹Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA

21 ¹⁰Department of Radiology, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

22 ¹¹Department of Dermatology, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

23 ¹²Engineering Science at Norwalk Community College Norwalk, CT, USA

24 ¹³Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA

25 ¹⁴Department of Dermatology, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT USA

26 ¹⁵Harvard Program in Therapeutic Science, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

27

28 *These authors contributed equally to this work

29 †Co-corresponding authors. E-mails: nleboeuf@bwh.harvard.edu; peter_sorger@hms.harvard.edu cc:

30 Maureen_Bergeron@hms.harvard.edu

31

32

33 **ORCID IDs:**

34 Malia McAvoy, MD, MS, 0000-0002-9998-4737

35 Ai-Tram N. Bui, 0000-0003-0133-7935

36 Deborah Plana, 0000-0002-4218-1693

37 Jordan T. Said, 0000-0002-0357-6916

38 Zizi Yu, 0000-0001-8566-0777

39 Jacob Freake, 0000-0002-5198-835X

- 40 Christopher Van, 0000-0003-3262-964X
- 41 Avilash Cramer, 0000-0003-0014-8921
- 42 Liwei Jiang, 0000-0002-1863-6803
- 43 Karen J. Lee, 0000-0003-4255-8355
- 44 Michael P. Short, PhD, 0000-0002-9216-2482
- 45 Sherry H. Yu, MD, 0000-0002-1432-9128
- 46 Arash Mostaghimi, MD, MPA, MPH, 0000-0002-6084-5617
- 47 Peter Sorger, PhD, 0000-0002-3364-1838
- 48 Nicole R. LeBoeuf, MD, MPH, 0000-0002-8264-834X

49 **ABSTRACT**

50 **Background:** In response to supply shortages during the COVID-19 pandemic, N95 filtering facepiece
51 respirators (FFRs or “masks”), which are typically single-use devices in healthcare settings, are routinely being
52 used for prolonged periods and in some cases decontaminated under “reuse” and “extended use” policies.

53 However, the reusability of N95 masks is often limited by degradation or breakage of elastic head bands and
54 issues with mask fit after repeated use. The purpose of this study was to develop a frame for N95 masks, using
55 readily available materials and 3D printing, which could replace defective or broken bands and improve fit.

56 **Results:** An iterative design process yielded a mask frame consisting of two 3D-printed side pieces, malleable
57 wire links that users press against their face, and cut lengths of elastic material that go around the head to hold the
58 frame and mask in place. Volunteers (n= 41; average BMI= 25.5), of whom 31 were women, underwent
59 qualitative fit with and without mask frames and one or more of four different brands of FFRs conforming to US
60 N95 or Chinese KN95 standards. Masks passed qualitative fit testing in the absence of a frame at rates varying
61 from 48 – 92% (depending on mask model and tester). For individuals for whom a mask passed testing, 75-100%
62 (average = 86%) also passed testing with a frame holding the mask in place. Among users for whom a mask failed
63 in initial fit testing, 41% passed using a frame. Success varied with mask model and across individuals.

64 **Conclusions:** The use of mask frames can prolong the lifespan of N95 and KN95 masks by serving as a substitute
65 for broken or defective bands without adversely affecting fit. Frames also have the potential to improve fit for
66 some individuals who cannot fit existing masks. Frames therefore represent a simple and inexpensive way of
67 extending the life and utility of PPE in short supply. For clinicians and institutions interested in mask frames,
68 designs and specifications are provided without restriction for use or modification. To ensure adequate
69 performance in clinical settings, qualitative fit testing with user-specific masks and frames is required.

70 **Keywords:** COVID-19, pandemic response, personal protective equipment (PPE), N95 respirators, KN95 masks,
71 3D printing, filtering face piece (FFP) respirator, mask frames, prototyping, occupational health

72 **BACKGROUND**

73 Frontline health care workers are vulnerable to infection by the severe acute respiratory syndrome
74 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which causes coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)(1): among healthcare workers
75 at the height of the pandemic in Wuhan, China, approximately 29% are thought to have acquired COVID-19
76 through hospital associated transmission (2). The most common routes of transmission for SARS-CoV-2 include:
77 droplet transmission via direct face-to-face contact between patients and healthcare providers through coughing,
78 sneezing, or speaking that aerosolizes virus, and aerosol-generating procedures such as intubation; indirect
79 transmission by touching surfaces contaminated with virus followed by touching the face, nose or eyes is another
80 suspected transmission route (3,4). Respiratory protection is an essential component of preventing hospital-based
81 infections during the current COVID-19 pandemic, but an unprecedented demand for N95 filtering face mask
82 respirators (FFRs; N95 masks) has led to severe shortages and many institutions have been forced to look for
83 ways to prolong mask usability and even alternative solutions to respiratory protection.

84 The US Centers for Disease Control (CDC) recommends that healthcare workers dispose of N95 masks
85 after each patient encounter. However, during the 2009 influenza A (H1N1) pandemic, which involved many
86 fewer cases and deaths than the current COVID-19 pandemic, N95 respirator supplies were depleted (5,6). An
87 evaluation of respiratory programs in California hospitals revealed that half of hospital managers interviewed
88 (n=48) reported shortages of N95 respirators due to increased demand and slow delivery from suppliers (7). In
89 response, guidelines were developed to preserve N95 supplies during shortages; these included “extended use”
90 and “reuse.” “Extended use” is defined as the practice of wearing the same respirator for contact with several
91 different patients infected with the same respiratory pathogen, without disposing of the respirator between
92 patients. “Reuse” refers to the practice of using the same N95 respirator after removing it (“doffing”), for instance
93 after a healthcare worker’s shift has ended, and then putting it back on (“donning”) prior to the next patient
94 encounter. In the current COVID-19 pandemic, in which the shortage of PPE is more severe and widespread than
95 in 2009, there is no specific regulation on the number donning/doffing cycles for N95 masks (8), although
96 previous work found that masks consistently failed a test for fit quality after five consecutive donnings (9).

97 Individual healthcare settings have therefore enacted their own policies, often with insufficient information, to
98 restrict respirator reuse and extended use (10).

99 In the US, N95 FFRs are regulated by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH;
100 part of the CDC) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and must conform to standards set out in US 42
101 CFR part 84. Other countries have analogous regulations, including the GB2626-2006 standard for KN95 masks
102 in China and the EN 149:2001 standard for FFP2 masks in Europe. All such masks must exhibit three essential
103 properties: (i) efficient filtration of small particles (ii) unencumbered inhalation and exhalation with a mask in
104 place and (iii) snug fit to the face of a user so that all inhaled air passes through the filtering fabric. Mask reuse is
105 often limited by problems achieving good fit as a result of breakage or degradation of elastic bands that hold the
106 mask in place. In addition, increasingly poor respirator fit with reuse of N95 masks occurs due to degradation in
107 nose clips and other components required to seal a mask tightly to a user's face (11).

108 The aim of this study was to develop a device to replace defective bands on N95 respirators without
109 interfering with successful fit, thereby prolonging the lifespan of N95 respirators for both extended use and reuse.
110 We also aimed to improve fit for individuals who failed baseline testing, thereby increasing the number of
111 individuals who could benefit from low-cost respiratory protection. In the latter case, a specific aim was to
112 improve the fit of KN95 masks, which are similar in performance to N95 FFRs (12) but are often observed to fail
113 fit testing (13). We sought to use readily available materials and common 3D printing technology in a design that
114 was made freely available for use or further modification.

115

116 **RESULTS**

117 **Frame design and fabrication**

118 Development of a modular mask frame model was inspired by the work of Dr. Christopher Wiles at the
119 University of Connecticut, who has used 3D printed frames to enable use of alternative filter fabrics such as
120 Halyard H600 sterilization wrap (14). We attempted to use the same relatively rigid 3D printed design to hold in
121 place a standard 3M Model 8210 (St. Paul, MN USA) N95 industrial respirator. However, we found that the
122 frame did not fit many individuals, particularly females with narrow faces. Previous research has shown that there

123 are key facial dimensions affecting respirator fit (15). We therefore sought to develop a frame with flexible
124 components that could be molded by a user to assist in optimizing fit along these dimensions. This was achieved
125 by using two malleable wire components (made of copper, steel or aluminum) to link two rigid lateral PLA
126 frames fabricated by 3D printing (**Figure 1**). The final design was the result of an iterative process, which
127 consisted of multiple rounds of mask and prototype fit testing on volunteers (students and healthcare
128 professionals) with design modifications made based on user feedback. Direct interaction between users and
129 designers facilitated the process. Key features added in the iterative design process included the production of two
130 frame sizes to improve fit to faces of difference sizes and shapes, the addition of clips to help secure the mask
131 frame to the underlying respirator and decrease the likelihood of the frame falling off during use, and
132 modifications to the location and length of the frame head bands to make donning and doffing easier. We freely
133 provide all designs in standard electronic formats for use by others or for further modification.

134 A total of six weeks was required to design, prototype, and fabricate mask frames for testing.
135 The resulting design was flexible enough to conform to a diversity of face types and sizes and also rigid enough to
136 seal masks to users' faces. Frames were fabricated from polylactic acid (PLA) on a standard 3D printer in less
137 than 30 min at a cost of approximately 0.50 USD. Two sizes of lateral frames were printed in PLA and made
138 available to participants: a "small" size (6.35 cm long) and a "regular" size (7.62 cm long) (**Figure 1A**).
139 Additional features included radiused edges on the lateral frame (**Figure 1B**) to prevent the N95 FFR from being
140 excessively deformed; deformation was observed with prototypes in which the edges were square or "V" shaped.
141 We tested two different methods of attaching the malleable wire, one that used adhesive (**Figure 2A**) and one that
142 involved twisting (**Figure 2B**). Note that slight modifications were necessary to accommodate 3D printed frames
143 to the two wire attachment methods; however, the methods of wire attachment did not detectably affect comfort or
144 function; design files for both prototypes are provided (**Additional Materials 1, 2, and 3**).

145 As a source of replacement elastic straps, we used non-latex phlebotomy tourniquets that are widely
146 available and made of an FDA-approved material (Monprene^(R) PR-23040). Elastic straps lock into slots on each
147 side of the 3D-printed piece and are cut to a standardized length that fits around users' heads, just like factory-
148 supplied straps (**Figure 3A, 3B**). Additional clips along the frame make it possible to secure any remaining

149 respirator bands to the frame. These clips are designed to optimize the pressure holding the mask firmly in place
150 (**Figure 1C, 3C**). A frame with an attached mask is donned just like a mask without a frame: the respirator is
151 brought to the face to cover the nose and mouth, the lower strap is brought up and over the top of the head and the
152 upper strap is pulled up behind the head. The nosepiece of the mask frame is then press-fit, or otherwise bent to
153 the shape of a user's nose (additional fitting instructions are provided in Methods; example fits shown in **Figure**
154 **4**). Individual users were allowed to choose a frame size based on whether their faces were “small” or “regular.”

155

156 **Selection of FFRs for testing**

157 Four different types of N95-style FFRs were selected for testing: a 3M Model 1860 N95, 3M Model 8210
158 N95, Kimberly Clark 46827/46767 (hereafter referred to as “duckbill”), and a Cooper KN95 (imprinted with
159 number XK02-001-00010; Cooper USA; Los Angeles, CA). The 3M model 1860, available in both small and
160 regular sizes, is a standard dome or cup-shaped respirator commonly used in healthcare settings (16) and is
161 fabricated from media (fabric) that provides enhanced fluid and splash resistance (to ASTM Test Method F1862
162 (17)). The Kimberly Clark regular (46767) and small (46827) models, like the 3M 1860 model, were used in
163 healthcare settings prior to the pandemic and are fabricated according to ASTM standards and but are duckbill
164 shaped instead of dome-shaped. We also tested an industrial 3M model 8210 mask, only available in a single
165 standard size, that would not normally be used in a healthcare setting but whose temporary use is permitted in the
166 US under an FDA Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) issued on April 3, 2020 (18). The Cooper flat-fold KN95
167 respirator, available in one standard size, was selected as prototypical of a non-US manufactured FFRs whose use
168 in healthcare is also allowed by an FDA EUA. Flat-fold respirators have a very different shape and fit from cup-
169 style respirators. With KN95 masks it has also been observed that even when filtration efficiency meets
170 specification fit can be problematic (19,20).

171

172 **Test subject demographics**

173 A total of 41 volunteers were involved in this study and consisted of attending physicians, resident
174 physicians, medical students, nurses, medical assistants, clinic staff, and research scientists, with predominantly

175 female participants (ranging from 50% to 92% depending on the test group; **Table 1**). The proportion of female
176 participants is representative of the healthcare workforce, which is predominantly female in the U.S. and
177 worldwide (21). Of note, prior literature shows that women fail fit testing approximately 10% more frequently
178 than men (22), suggesting a greater potential need for methods to improve fit with female FFR users. Individuals
179 had a BMI ranging from 18.5 to 56.6 (averaging 25.5 for all groups). The study was approved by the Partners
180 Healthcare Institutional Review Board (protocol 2020P001209) and all volunteers provided informed consent.

181

182 **Qualitative FFR fit testing**

183 Among the group of 41 volunteers, 32 were fit-tested with 3M model 1860 masks, 10 with 3M 8210, 25
184 with Cooper KN95 masks, and 13 with the Kimberly Clark duckbills; not all masks could be tested on all
185 individuals due to severely limited mask supply resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. When available,
186 information provided by the participants about which mask size they had previously used in a clinical setting was
187 used to guide the selection of an appropriate respirator and mask frame size for this study (in all cases previous
188 experience was with a small or regular 3M model 1860; **Table 1**). Qualitative fit testing was performed using a
189 3M FT14 standardized hood and 3M FT-32 bitter testing solution; if a user could taste the aerosolized fluid, the
190 test was judged to have failed. Fit was tested without a mask frame (the baseline condition) and with the 3D
191 printed mask frame in place of the mask straps (the test condition; outlined in **Figure 5**). For 3M 8210 masks and
192 Kimberly Clark duckbills, 9/10 (90%) and 12/13 (92.3%) of participants passed baseline testing without a 3D
193 printed mask frame, respectively. For the 1860 and KN95 masks, baseline passing rates were lower at 28/32
194 (87.5%) and 12/25 (48.0%), respectively. The passing rates for 1860, duckbill, and 8210 masks are consistent
195 with previous literature demonstrating 82-95% fit rates across N95 respirator models (22,23). We then asked
196 whether individuals for whom a mask passed qualitative fit testing in the baseline condition would also pass fit
197 testing when elastic straps were removed (or allowed to hang down) and the masks held in place with a frame and
198 replacement straps. For the 8210 (**Table 2; Figure 4B**), 100% of participants who passed qualitative fit testing at
199 baseline preserved fit using a mask frame (9/9). For individuals who passed fit testing with an 1860 mask (**Table**
200 **2; Figure 4A**), a KN95 mask (**Table 2; Figure 4D**), or a Kimberly Clark duckbill (**Table 2; Figure 4C**), the

201 passing rates with the 3D mask frame in the absence of the original mask straps were 22/28 (78.6%), 11/12
202 (91.7%), and 9/12 (75.0%), respectively.

203 We also asked whether mask frames could improve fit for participants who failed baseline testing. For the
204 Model 8210 mask, use of a frame made it possible for a single participant who did not fit a mask at baseline to
205 pass. However, in no case was a frame able to improve fit of an 1860 mask (0/4 participants) or a Kimberly Clark
206 duckbills (0/1 participants). In contrast, 46.2% (6/13 participants) for whom the KN95 mask did not pass fit
207 testing under baseline conditions achieved an acceptable fit with a frame (**Table 2**).

208

209 **DISCUSSION**

210 In this paper we describe an iterative design process, involving multiple rounds of prototyping, clinical
211 feedback, and design modification that resulted in a simple frame consisting of two identical 3D printed
212 components (made in two sizes to accommodate different faces) and two pieces of malleable wire that together
213 can hold an N95 or KN95 mask to users' faces in the absence of factory-supplied straps. Such mask frames are
214 reusable and can be sterilized using 70% isopropyl alcohol wipes. Across a diverse group of volunteers, we found
215 that mask frames were effective in replacing the original straps on all three masks tested. Results were mixed
216 with respect to our additional goal of improving fit for participants who failed baseline qualitative fit-testing:
217 frames were effective for some individuals and mask models and ineffective in other cases. The most promising
218 results were obtained with KN95 flat-fold masks, for which achieving a good fit is known to be challenging(13).
219 Replacing elastic straps broken or degraded with age, multiple donning/doffing cycles, or repeated
220 decontamination and increasing the number of individuals who can fit KN95 masks would immediately impact
221 PPE supplies for healthcare workers.

222 Multiple recent projects have attempted to develop reusable respirators to replace disposable N95s,
223 especially within the global 3D printing community. For instance, the Copper3D NanoHack mask is printed with
224 a PLA filament as a flat piece, and is manually assembled into a 3D configuration using hot air (e.g. hairdryer) or
225 hot water (24); two reusable filter cartridges are then inserted into an intake port. The HEPA Mask (25), Creality
226 Mask (26) and the Lowell Makes Mask (27) all involve similar 3D printed components in PLA but with different

227 variations in the filter holders. However, producing FFRs *de novo* involves several challenges, including securing
228 a supply of suitable filters and achieving the proper fit for a wide range of users. This issue of fit has been tackled
229 by printing masks in several sizes, experimenting with flexible materials or surface scanning an intended user's
230 face and creating a custom-fit device (World Advanced Saving Project (WASP)(28) and Bellus3D (29)).
231 However, throughput is currently limited (30) and in some cases supplies of the necessary filters have been
232 largely depleted (31). Thus, conventional N95 masks are likely to remain an essential component of PPE during
233 the current pandemic (32).

234 How great is the need for extending usable mask life? Historical guidance by the National Institute for
235 Occupational Safety (NIOSH) specifies that the useful lifetime of NIOSH-approved FFRs is limited by filter load
236 and that any filter or mask should be replaced if it becomes soiled, damaged, or causes noticeably increased
237 breathing resistance (33). In environments that generate high cumulative filter loading, the recommended
238 maximum lifespan for N95 respirators is eight hours and it is standard practice in healthcare to dispose of N95
239 masks after each patient encounter. However, during the first SARS pandemic, the CDC stated that “health care
240 facilities may consider reuse as long as the device has not been obviously soiled or damaged (e.g. creased or
241 torn)” and “if a sufficient supply of respirators is not available (34).” Multiple FDA Emergency Use
242 Authorizations (EUAs) issued during the COVID-19 pandemic have further expanded on this concept and led to
243 the use of a wide variety of decontamination methods including UV germicidal irradiation, vaporous and ionized
244 hydrogen peroxide (VHP/iHP) and moist heat (35–42), all of which promise to enable N95 reuse (for instance, the
245 FDA EUA for the Battelle decontamination system permits up to 20 vaporous hydrogen peroxide
246 decontamination cycles per respirator(43)). However, mask reuse is frequently limited by breakage or
247 degradation of the elastic bands that hold a mask in place and it has been reported that N95 masks stored in
248 preparation for a pandemic also have a high rate of band failure (11).

249 Moreover, quantitative fit testing (e.g. using a PortaCount quantitative fit testing apparatus, TSI Inc.,
250 Shoreview, MN) has shown that multiple donnings and doffings degrade fit independent of band failure. Bergman
251 et al. (9) found that, after five consecutive donnings, fit factors consistently dropped below 100, the cut-off
252 between passing and failing the test. Vuma et al. (44) showed that, when 25 test subjects performed consecutive

253 N95 donning and doffing operations, fit factor differed significantly between the first and the sixth re-donnings.
254 After the sixth donning, only ~68% of study subjects achieved a passing fit. Degsys et al. (45) found that an
255 increase in fit failures was associated with an increasing number of shifts, each of which was associated with a
256 donning and doffing cycle (median 4 shifts) and increasing hours of use (median 14 hours). It is thought that
257 failures of fit with prolonged use of N95 masks involves degradation of the malleable nose clips and other
258 components that help seal a mask tightly to a user's face. Additionally, mask fit is adversely affected by repeated
259 cycles of decontamination across a variety of methods (including heat and ethanol) (46). If undetected, poor fit
260 causes air to flow around the mask (11) potentially increasing disease transmission.

261 Problems with fit are not restricted to masks that are being reused: it has previously been reported that
262 even with new masks, about 17% of users will fail fit testing with any specific model of N95 or N95-equivalent
263 mask (23). The fit failure rate for KN95s has not been extensively quantified in the literature, but available studies
264 suggest that fit failure is an issue with a majority of KN95 models (40). Improving fit by using a frame would
265 therefore be helpful even in non-pandemic situations. The problem with failure to fit any mask is made worse in a
266 pandemic by shortages in alternative forms of respiratory protection (e.g., powered air-purifying respirators(47)).
267 Thus, both pandemic and non-pandemic respiratory protection presents a substantial need for devices – such as
268 the mask frames described here - to extend the useful lifetime of FFRs, such as N95 or KN95 masks, or improve
269 fit of new masks. It must be noted, however, that clinical data supporting extended use and reuse of N95 masks,
270 with or without decontamination, remains limited. Concerns about extended use and reuse involve not only fit and
271 the adequacy of the seal to a user's face (45), but also potential infection risks acquired during donning/doffing
272 (since the outer surface of respirators can be contaminated with infectious agents that can be transferred to a user
273 (48)) and reductions in filtration efficiency over time. The mask frames described here address only the first of
274 these issues.

275

276 **Limitations of this study**

277 This study has several limitations; most notably, that sample sizes and the number of mask models tested
278 were small. We were unable to follow up preliminary but promising data that frames can improve the fit of KN95

279 masks. These limitations reflect continuing shortage in FFRs of all types and our inability to divert more than a
280 small number of masks from hospital or staff use to a research project. In particular, results would be improved by
281 finding a much larger number of participants who failed baseline fit testing and from whom multiple models of
282 masks could be evaluated with and without frames. For all of the masks used in this study straps were artificially
283 broken or allowed to hang free; to better represent the real-world use case it will be necessary to perform fit
284 testing with and without a mask frame after extended N95 mask use in a clinical setting. Our data suggest that the
285 precise shape of a mask and the properties of the material may determine whether a frame can successfully
286 substitute for original straps or improve fit. Additional research will be required to identify these variables and
287 address them. Ideally, all of these issues will become increasingly possible to address as supply disruptions recede
288 and sufficient FFRs can be dedicated to research studies.

289

290 **CONCLUSIONS**

291 The use of the 3D-printed mask frames described in this study can prolong the lifespan of N95 and KN95
292 masks by serving as a substitute for broken or defective bands without adversely affecting fit. Frames also have
293 the potential to improve fit for some individuals who cannot use existing masks. Both defective straps and poor fit
294 are limiting factors in extended mask use and in the reuse of masks after decontamination, as masks with either
295 defect are currently discarded. Thus, improving mask fit through use of a frame is expected to help offset urgent
296 respirator supply shortages during the COVID-19 pandemic and also help after the pandemic passes. All design
297 files and testing results are included in this manuscript and available for reuse without restriction; design
298 information is also available via the PanFab website (<https://www.panfab.org/>). Our prototyping and testing
299 efforts took place over the span of approximately 6 weeks and use of our designs should save substantial time
300 relative to designing mask frames *de novo*. However we suggest that each group perform its own fit testing with a
301 representative group of users. We believe that the results and designs presented here are one step in improving the
302 supply and effectiveness of PPE in this pandemic and in increasing our collective ability to respond to future
303 healthcare crises.

304

305 **METHODS**

306 **Mask Frame Software and Design**

307 3D printed mask frames were designed in Rhinoceros^(R) Rhino 6 (**Figure 1**) in two sizes. A 3D model (.3dm) of
308 the lateral frames were exported in Rhino 6 to a Standard Tessellation Language (.STL) file. The .STL was
309 uploaded to 3dPrinterOS, a cloud based 3D printing service. 3dPrinterOS converted the .STL to a G-code file,
310 which contains machine commands that control the 3D printers' movement and deposition of material, and sent to
311 a 3D printer. Print settings were chosen by using the default values for the 3dPrinterOS customized for the
312 Dremel 3d45 3D printer, including print nozzle temperature of 230°C and print bed temperature of 60°C. Other
313 printer settings included a standard layer height of .3mm, a 1.2mm sidewall shell thickness, 10% infill in a 'grid'
314 pattern, and a top and bottom layer shell thickness of 2mm.

315

316 **3D Printer Model and Hardware**

317 Dremel branded 1.75 mm diameter PLA was used on a Dremel 3d45 3D printer for printing all components. The
318 printer has a .4mm nozzle extrusion width, and a build volume of 10 x 6.7 x 6 inches (254 x 152 x 170 mm). Print
319 time for one regular sized mask frame was ~ 30 min.

320

321 **Mask Frame Assembly**

322 Two methods of mask frame assembly were used, each of which involved a slight modification to the 3D printed
323 lateral frame. **Method 1 (Figure 2A)** used an adhesive, cyanoacrylate (also known as super glue), to join the
324 mask frame components; the prototype design is shown in **Figure 1**. Method 1 assembly sequence is as follows:
325 gather components (2 flexible wires cut to 127 mm, 2 PLA lateral frames, and 1 bottle of superglue). (1) Place
326 one drop of super glue in the lateral frame joint. (2) Insert wire into joint. Follow instructions accompanying super
327 glue for holding wire in place to properly allow the glue to set and cure. (3) Repeat for each joint.

328 **Method 2 (Figure 2B)** involved a mechanical connection in which formable wire was twisted to join mask frame
329 components. Method 2 assembly sequence is as follows: gather components (2 flexible wires cut to 195 mm and
330 two PLA lateral frames that have a hole through the joint). (1) Push wire through the joint in the lateral frame. (2)

331 Loop wire back. (3) Twist wire around itself. Pliers are recommended to assist in bending and twisting of wire to
332 ensure secure twist. (4) Repeat for each connection.

333

334 **Band and Clip Attachment**

335 Based on prior work creating 3D printed mask frames by colleagues at the University of Connecticut (14), the
336 band material used for this study was Monprene^(R) PR-23040 in the following size: 0.25 in x 0.015 in (Teknor
337 Apex; Pawtucket, RI). Two strips of elastic 305 and 330 mm in length were cut for the 1860 and KN95 masks,
338 and two strips 356 and 381 mm in length were cut for the 8210. A knot was tied at each end of each band,
339 approximately 25 mm from the end of the band. The knot locks into each slot in the PLA frame as shown in
340 **Figure 3A** and **Figure 3B**. The clips along the PLA frame secure to existing bands of the respirator, if still
341 present, to secure the frame to the mask (**Figure 3C**).

342

343 **Donning, Doffing and Sterilization**

344 Once the mask frame is attached to the respirator using the clips, the respirator is donned just like a respirator
345 without the frame. Holding the respirator and mask frame in the palms of the hands, the respirator is brought to
346 the face to cover the nose and mouth, and the mask frame should not pass outside the borders of the mask. The
347 bottom strap attached to the mask frame is brought up and over the top of the head and placed at the nape of the
348 neck below the ears. The upper strap is pulled up behind the head and placed at the crown of the head. Then, the
349 nosepiece of the mask frame is manipulated in the shape of the user's nose until a secure seal and good fit are
350 achieved (**Figure 4**). A seal check is performed by placing both hands over the mask and exhaling. If air leakage
351 is observed, there is not a proper seal. Re-adjusting the nosepiece or pulling the straps tighter should be attempted
352 until a proper seal is obtained. Mask frames can be sterilized using 70% isopropyl alcohol wipes.

353

354 **Qualitative Fit Testing**

355 This study was approved by the Partners Healthcare Institutional Review Board (protocol #2020P001209). All
356 subjects underwent qualitative fit testing at the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute during May-June, 2020. Participants

357 included attending physicians, medical students and researchers. Qualitative fit testing using a 3M FT14 hood and
358 3M FT-32 bitter testing solution was performed over two different testing sessions, both consisting of tests
359 without the mask frame (baseline) and with the 3D printed mask frame (**Figure 5**). Qualitative fit failure occurred
360 if the participant could taste the solution (bitter taste). Four different models of respirators were tested: 1860,
361 8210, duckbill, and KN95. Data was analyzed using Prism version 8 (GraphPad).

362

363 **ABBREVIATIONS**

364 3D: 3 dimensional

365 FFRs: Filtering Facepiece Respirators

366 IRB: Institutional Review Board

367 PLA: Polylactic Acid

368 PPE: Personal Protective Equipment

369

370 **DECLARATIONS**

371 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

372 The Partners Healthcare Institutional Review Board approved this study (protocol #2020P001209).

373

374 **Consent for publication**

375 Consent for publication has been obtained from the study participants. Written informed consent for publication
376 was obtained from the study participants pictured in **Figure 4**. A copy of the consent form is available for review
377 by the Editor of this journal.

378

379 **Availability of data and materials**

380 All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary
381 information files.

382

383 **Competing interests**

- 384 • A Mostaghimi is a consultant or has received honoraria from Pfizer, 3Derm, and hims and has equity in Lucid
385 Dermatology and hims. He is an associate editor for JAMA Dermatology. Mostaghimi declares that none of
386 these relationships are directly or indirectly related to the content of this manuscript.
- 387 • PK Sorger is a member of the SAB or Board of Directors of Applied Biomath, Glencoe Software and
388 RareCyte Inc and has equity in these companies. In the last five years the Sorger lab has received research
389 funding from Novartis and Merck. Sorger declares that none of these relationships are directly or indirectly
390 related to the content of this manuscript.
- 391 • NR LeBoeuf is a consultant for or has received honoraria from the following companies: Seattle Genetics,
392 Sanofi and Bayer.

393

394 **Funding**

395 Local fabricators, makers and citizens generously donated their time and resources and were essential for all
396 stages of the project. This work was also supported by the Harvard MIT Center for Regulatory Sciences and by
397 NIH/NCI grants U54-CA225088 (to PKS, NL and DP) and by T32-GM007753 (to DP) and by the Harvard
398 Ludwig Center.

399

400 **Author Contributions**

401 Mask frame design prototyping and manufacturing: M.M., C.H., T.B, D.P, J.F, C.V., A.C., L.S., L.J., B.B., S.Y.

402 Mask frame clinical testing: M.M., T.B., J.S., Z.Y., H.Y., D.K., K.L., S.J.L., M.S., S.Y., A.M.

403 Writing: M.M., C.H., T.B., D.P., P.K.S., N.L.

404 Greater Boston Pandemic Fabrication (PanFab) Consortium Coordination: D.P., H.Y., P.K.S., N.L.

405

406 **Acknowledgements**

407 Above all we thank the members of the Greater Boston Pandemic Fabrication Team (PanFab) for technical,
408 administrative, and logistical support necessary for the execution of this project. Membership found at
409 <https://www.panfab.org/the-team-and-the-project/consortium-members>.

410 Additional support was given by Harvard University Graduate School of Design, where 3D printing for the
411 project occurred, in addition to providing access to design software and materials for prototyping.

412

413

414

415 REFERENCES

- 416 1. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019
417 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From the Chinese Center for
418 Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA*. 2020 Apr 7;323(13):1239.
- 419 2. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients
420 With 2019 Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*. 2020 Mar 17;323(11):1061.
- 421 3. Peng X, Xu X, Li Y, Cheng L, Zhou X, Ren B. Transmission routes of 2019-nCoV and controls in dental
422 practice. *Int J Oral Sci*. 2020 Dec;12(1):9.
- 423 4. Prati C, Pelliccioni GA, Sambri V, Chersoni S, Gandolfi MG. COVID-19: its impact on dental schools in
424 Italy, clinical problems in endodontic therapy and general considerations. *Int Endod J*. 2020
425 May;53(5):723–5.
- 426 5. Rebmann T, Wagner W. Infection preventionists’ experience during the first months of the 2009 novel
427 H1N1 influenza A pandemic. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2009 Dec;37(10):e5–16.
- 428 6. Murray M, Grant J, Bryce E, Chilton P, Forrester L. Facial Protective Equipment, Personnel, and
429 Pandemics: Impact of the Pandemic (H1N1) 2009 Virus on Personnel and Use of Facial Protective
430 Equipment. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2010 Oct;31(10):1011–6.
- 431 7. Beckman S, Materna B, Goldmacher S, Zipprich J, D’Alessandro M, Novak D, et al. Evaluation of
432 respiratory protection programs and practices in California hospitals during the 2009-2010 H1N1 influenza
433 pandemic. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2013 Nov;41(11):1024–31.
- 434 8. Shortage of personal protective equipment endangering health workers worldwide [Internet]. World Health
435 Organization. [cited 2020 Jun 27]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/03-03-2020-](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/03-03-2020-shortage-of-personal-protective-equipment-endangering-health-workers-worldwide)
436 [shortage-of-personal-protective-equipment-endangering-health-workers-worldwide](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/03-03-2020-shortage-of-personal-protective-equipment-endangering-health-workers-worldwide)
- 437 9. Bergman MS, Viscusi DJ, Zhuang Z, Palmiero AJ, Powell JB, Shaffer RE. Impact of multiple consecutive
438 donnings on filtering facepiece respirator fit. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2012 May;40(4):375–
439 80.


- 440 10. Extended use, reuse, and conservation of personal protective equipment policy [Internet]. The General
441 Hospital Corporation; 2020. Available from:
442 [https://www.massgeneral.org/assets/MGH/pdf/news/coronavirus/guidance-on-extended-use-and-reuse-of-](https://www.massgeneral.org/assets/MGH/pdf/news/coronavirus/guidance-on-extended-use-and-reuse-of-n95-respirators-surgical-masks-prodecural-masks-and-eye-protection.pdf)
443 [n95-respirators-surgical-masks-prodecural-masks-and-eye-protection.pdf](https://www.massgeneral.org/assets/MGH/pdf/news/coronavirus/guidance-on-extended-use-and-reuse-of-n95-respirators-surgical-masks-prodecural-masks-and-eye-protection.pdf)
- 444 11. CDC. Decontamination and Reuse of Filtering Facepiece Respirators [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control
445 and Prevention. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 27]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/decontamination-reuse-respirators.html)
446 [ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/decontamination-reuse-respirators.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/ppe-strategy/decontamination-reuse-respirators.html)
- 447 12. 3M. Comparison of FFP2, KN95, and N95 and Other Filtering Facepiece Respirator Classes. Technical
448 Bulletin. Revision 4. [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
449 [https://multimedia.3m.com/mws/media/1791500O/comparison-ffp2-kn95-n95-filtering-facepiece-respirator-](https://multimedia.3m.com/mws/media/1791500O/comparison-ffp2-kn95-n95-filtering-facepiece-respirator-classes-tb.pdf)
450 [classes-tb.pdf](https://multimedia.3m.com/mws/media/1791500O/comparison-ffp2-kn95-n95-filtering-facepiece-respirator-classes-tb.pdf)
- 451 13. Health C for D and R. Certain Filtering Facepiece Respirators from China May Not Provide Adequate
452 Respiratory Protection - Letter to Health Care Providers. FDA [Internet]. 2020 Jun 7 [cited 2020 Jun 27];
453 Available from: [https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/letters-health-care-providers/certain-filtering-](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/letters-health-care-providers/certain-filtering-facepiece-respirators-china-may-not-provide-adequate-respiratory-protection-letter)
454 [facepiece-respirators-china-may-not-provide-adequate-respiratory-protection-letter](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/letters-health-care-providers/certain-filtering-facepiece-respirators-china-may-not-provide-adequate-respiratory-protection-letter)
- 455 14. Thingiverse.com. Mask Frame “CEG Extreme” and Small n95 fitter (High Filtration with Halyard H600) by
456 ctwiles [Internet]. [cited 2020 May 8]. Available from: <https://www.thingiverse.com/thing:4262131>
- 457 15. Lin Y-C, Chen C-P. Characterization of small-to-medium head-and-face dimensions for developing
458 respirator fit test panels and evaluating fit of filtering facepiece respirators with different faceseal design.
459 Tang D, editor. PLoS ONE. 2017 Nov 27;12(11):e0188638.
- 460 16. Niezgodna G, Kim J-H, Roberge RJ, Benson SM. Flat fold and cup-shaped N95 filtering facepiece respirator
461 face seal area and pressure determinations: a stereophotogrammetry study. *J Occup Environ Hyg*.
462 2013;10(8):419–24.
- 463 17. ASTM F1862 / F1862M - 17 [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. [cited 2020 Jul 10].
464 Available from: <https://wwwn.cdc.gov/PPEInfo/Standards/Info/ASTMF1862/F1862M17>
- 465 18. Umbrella EUA: Non-NIOSH-Approved Disposable Filtering Facepiece Respirators Manufactured in China
466 [Internet]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration; 2020. Available from:
467 <https://www.fda.gov/media/136664/download>
- 468 19. Counterfeit Respirators / Misrepresentation of NIOSH-Approval | NPPTL | NIOSH | CDC [Internet]. 2020
469 [cited 2020 May 29]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/usernotices/counterfeitResp.html>
- 470 20. International Respirator Assessment Request | NPPTL | NIOSH | CDC [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 10].
471 Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/respirators/testing/NonNIOSH.html>
- 472 21. Spotlight on statistics: Gender and health workforce statistics [Internet]. Department of Human Resources
473 for Health, World Health Organization; 2008. Available from:
474 https://www.who.int/hrh/statistics/spotlight_2.pdf?ua=1
- 475 22. McMahon E, Wada K, Dufresne A. Implementing fit testing for N95 filtering facepiece respirators: Practical
476 information from a large cohort of hospital workers. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2008
477 May;36(4):298–300.

- 478 23. Wilkinson IJ, Pisaniello D, Ahmad J, Edwards S. Evaluation of a Large-Scale Quantitative Respirator-Fit
479 Testing Program for Healthcare Workers: Survey Results. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2010
480 Sep;31(9):918–25.
- 481 24. Hack the Pandemic – Copper 3D | Antibacterial 3D Printing [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jun 27]. Available from:
482 <https://copper3d.com/hackthepandemic/>
- 483 25. Thingiverse.com. HEPA Covid Coronavirus Face Mask by Kvatthro [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jun 27].
484 Available from: <https://www.thingiverse.com/thing:4222563>
- 485 26. 3D Printed Face Mask--- No Worries on Mask Shortage and Coronavirus Infection [Internet]. [cited 2020
486 Jun 27]. Available from: <https://creality.com/info/makers-guide-3d-printed-face-mask-no-worries-on-mask-shortage-and-virus-infection-i00248i1.html>
- 488 27. COVID-19 Response [Internet]. Lowell Makes. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 27]. Available from:
489 <https://lowellmakes.com/covid-19-response/>
- 490 28. Sher D. WASP shares open source processes for production of personalized PPE masks and helmets
491 [Internet]. 3D Printing Media Network. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 27]. Available from:
492 <https://www.3dprintingmedia.network/personalized-ppe-mask/>
- 493 29. How to Make Bellus3D’s Face Mask Fitter [Internet]. Bellus3D: High-quality 3D face scanning. [cited 2020
494 Jun 27]. Available from: <http://www.bellus3d.com/solutions/facemask>
- 495 30. Tino R, Moore R, Antoline S, Ravi P, Wake N, Ionita CN, et al. COVID-19 and the role of 3D printing in
496 medicine. *3D Print Med*. 2020 Dec;6(1):11, s41205-020-00064–7.
- 497 31. Jacobs A, Richtel M, Baker M. ‘At War With No Ammo’: Doctors Say Shortage of Protective Gear Is Dire.
498 *The New York Times* [Internet]. 2020 Mar 19 [cited 2020 May 28]; Available from:
499 <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/19/health/coronavirus-masks-shortage.html>
- 500 32. National Academies of Sciences E, Division H and M, Services B on HC, Forum NCP. Proceedings of a
501 Workshop [Internet]. National Academies Press (US); 2017 [cited 2020 Feb 11]. Available from:
502 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/books/NBK538013/>
- 503 33. NIOSH guide to the selection and use of particulate respirators certified under 42 CFR 84. 2019 Nov 7
504 [cited 2020 Jun 27]; Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/docs/96-101/default.html>
- 505 34. Interim Domestic Guidance on the Use of Respirators to Prevent Transmission of SARS [Internet]. 2019
506 [cited 2020 Jun 27]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/sars/clinical/respirators.html>
- 507 35. Kumar A, Kasloff SB, Leung A, Cutts T, Strong JE, Hills K, et al. N95 Mask Decontamination using
508 Standard Hospital Sterilization Technologies [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Apr
509 [cited 2020 Jun 27]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.05.20049346>
- 510 36. Kumar M, Mazur S, Ork BL, Postnikova E, Hensley LE, Jahrling PB, et al. Inactivation and safety testing of
511 Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus. *Journal of Virological Methods*. 2015 Oct;223:13–8.
- 512 37. Evaluation of Five Decontamination Methods for Filtering Facepiece Respirators. *The Annals of*
513 *Occupational Hygiene* [Internet]. 2009 Oct 4 [cited 2020 Jun 27]; Available from:

- 514 <https://academic.oup.com/annweh/article/53/8/815/154763/Evaluation-of-Five-Decontamination-Methods-for>
515 for
- 516 38. Viscusi DJ, King WP, Shaffer RE. Effect of Decontamination on the Filtration Efficiency of Two Filtering
517 Facepiece Respirator Models. 2007;24:15.
- 518 39. Bergman MS, Viscusi DJ, Heimbuch BK, Wander JD, Sambol AR, Shaffer RE. Evaluation of Multiple (3-
519 Cycle) Decontamination Processing for Filtering Facepiece Respirators. *Journal of Engineered Fibers and*
520 *Fabrics*. 2010 Dec;5(4):155892501000500.
- 521 40. Anderegg L, Meisenhelder C, Ngooi CO, Liao L, Xiao W, Chu S, et al. A Scalable Method of Applying
522 Heat and Humidity for Decontamination of N95 Respirators During the COVID-19 Crisis [Internet].
523 *Occupational and Environmental Health*; 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Jun 27]. Available from:
524 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.09.20059758>
- 525 41. Kenney P, Chan BK, Kortright K, Cintron M, Havill N, Russi M, et al. Hydrogen Peroxide Vapor
526 sterilization of N95 respirators for reuse [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Mar [cited
527 2020 Jun 27]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.03.24.20041087>
- 528 42. Cramer A, Plana D, Yang HL, Carmack M, Tian E, Sinha MS, et al. Analysis of SteraMist ionized hydrogen
529 peroxide technology as a method for sterilizing N95 respirators and other personal protective equipment
530 [Internet]. *Occupational and Environmental Health*; 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Apr 24]. Available from:
531 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.19.20069997>
- 532 43. US Food and Drug Administration. Emergency Use Authorization; Battelle Critical Care Decontamination
533 System. 2020.
- 534 44. Vuma CD, Manganyi J, Wilson K, Rees D. The Effect on Fit of Multiple Consecutive Donning and Doffing
535 of N95 Filtering Facepiece Respirators. *Annals of Work Exposures and Health*. 2019 Oct 11;63(8):930–6.
- 536 45. Degesys NF, Wang RC, Kwan E, Fahimi J, Noble JA, Raven MC. Correlation Between N95 Extended Use
537 and Reuse and Fit Failure in an Emergency Department. *JAMA* [Internet]. 2020 Jun 4 [cited 2020 Jun 27];
538 Available from: <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2767023>
- 539 46. Fischer R, Morris DH, van Doremalen N, Sarchette S, Matson J, Bushmaker T, et al. Assessment of N95
540 respirator decontamination and re-use for SARS-CoV-2 [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*;
541 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Jul 13]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.11.20062018>
- 542 47. Policy B on HS, Medicine I of. Defining PAPRs and Current Standards [Internet]. *The Use and*
543 *Effectiveness of Powered Air Purifying Respirators in Health Care: Workshop Summary*. National
544 Academies Press (US); 2015 [cited 2020 Jul 10]. Available from:
545 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK294223/>
- 546 48. Chughtai AA, Stelzer-Braid S, Rawlinson W, Pontivivo G, Wang Q, Pan Y, et al. Contamination by
547 respiratory viruses on outer surface of medical masks used by hospital healthcare workers. *BMC Infect Dis*.
548 2019 Dec;19(1):491.


549

550 **FIGURES**



551


552 **Figure 1.** Mask frame components. **A)** PLA lateral frames in two sizes: the small size is 6.35 cm long and regular
553 size is 7.62 cm long. **B and C)** Assembled mask frames consisting of both mask frame and malleable wire
554 (copper, steel, or aluminum). Note that this mask frame involves attaching 3D printed components to wire using
555 cyanoacrylate “superglue”. A mechanical attachment method is described in Figure 2.



556

557 **Figure 2.** Methods for mask frame assembly. **A)** Method One for assembly of mask frame for N95 respirators
558 utilizing glue adhesive. 1) One drop of cyanoacrylate superglue is placed into the end slot for the wire within the
559 PLA lateral frame. 2) The end of a wire is inserted into the slot. 3) All four wire ends are inserted into the PLA
560 slots as shown to complete the frame. **B)** Method Two for assembly of mask frame for N95 respirators using wire
561 alone (no adhesive). 1) Wire is pushed through the opening in the PLA lateral frame. 2) The wire is looped back
562 and 3) twisted around itself using pliers. 4) This process is repeated for each of the 4 total connections.

563



564

565 **Figure 3.** Attachment of the head band to a mask frame. **A)** A knot is tied at the end of each band and the band is
566 then slid into and locked in place using the PLA slot **B)** Mask frame with bands **C)** Clip attachment of the frame
567 to the bands on the 3M N95 Model 1860 respirator.

568


569



570

571 **Figure 4.** Properly donned mask frames and respirators on three different volunteers. **A)** A 3M 1860 N95 domed
572 healthcare respirator, **B)** a 3M 8210 N95 domed industrial respirator (note the a valve-less version of the model is
573 used in healthcare settings but was not always available for testing due to widespread respirator shortages) **C)** a
574 Kimberly Clark duckbill, and **D)** a KN95 flat-fold respirator. The bands should be sufficiently tight and the
575 nosepiece manipulated to achieve a good seal.

576



577

578

579 **Figure 5.** Flow chart of study methods.

580

581

582

583

584

585

586 **TABLES**

587 **Table 1.** Demographics and characteristics of participants undergoing baseline fit testing. SD = standard
588 deviation.

	No. (%) or Mean +/- SD (range)			
Characteristic	1860 N95 respirators (n=32)	8210 N95 respirators (n=10)	KN95 Respirators (n=25)	Kimberly Clark duckbill respirators (n=13)
Gender				
Female	18 (56.3%)	5 (50%)	22 (88%)	12 (92.3%)
Male	14 (43.8%)	5 (50%)	3 (12%)	1 (8.3%)
Age	37.6 +/- 10.7	30.7 +/- 5.7	36.5 +/- 12.5	33.6 +/- 10.2
Ethnicity				
Asian/Pacific Islander	10 (31.3%)	4 (40%)	5 (20%)	0
White/Caucasian	10 (31.3%)	6 (60%)	8 (32%)	3 (25%)
Black/African American	10 (31.3%)	0 (0%)	9 (36%)	8 (66.7%)
Hispanic/Latino	2 (6.3%)	0	3 (12%)	2 (16.7%)
Body mass index (BMI)	25.7 +/- 7.8	23.4 +/-2.7	26.6 +/- 8.5	30.5 +/- 10.2
Healthcare role				
Attending physician	16 (50%)	1 (10%)	6 (24%)	1 (8.3%)
Resident physician	0	2 (20%)	2 (8%)	0
Medical student	2 (6.3%)	3 (30%)	2 (8%)	0
Graduate student	0	1 (10%)	0	0
Researcher	2 (6.5%)	3 (30%)	1 (4%)	0
Nurse	4 (12.5%)	0	5 (20%)	3 (25%)
Medical Assistant	5 (15.6%)	0	5 (20%)	5 (38.5%)

Clinic Staff	3 (9.4%)	0	4 (16%)	4 (30.8%)
Mask size (previously fitted)				
Small	10 (31.3%)	5 (50%)	6 (24%)	1 (8.3%)
Regular	22 (68.8%)	5 (50%)	19 (76%)	12 (92.3%)

589 **Table 2.** Qualitative fit testing results using mask frames.

Number Passed Qualitative Fit Test

Mask Type	Baseline Testing of Mask without Frame	Participants Who Passed Baseline: Mask with Frame (Preserving Fit)	Participants who Failed Baseline: Mask with Frame (Improving Inadequate Fit)
8210 model (Total n=10)	9/10 (90%)	9/9 (100%)	1/1 (100%)
1860 model (Total n=32)	28/32 (87.5%)	22/28 (78.6%)	0/4 (0%)
KN95 model (Total n=25)	12/25 (48.0%)	11/12 (91.7%)	6/13 (46.2%)
Kimberly Clark duckbill model (Total n=13)	12/13 (92.3%)	9/12 (75.0%)	0/1 (0%)

590

591 **ADDITIONAL MATERIALS**

592 Additional Material 1: .STL file for mask frame design corresponding to adhesive attachment method, “PanFab-
593 MaskFrame-RigidLateralFrame-AdhesiveConnection.stl”

594 Additional Material 2: .STLfile for mask frame design corresponding to mechanical attachment method, “PanFab-
595 MaskFrame-RigidLateralFrame-MechanicalConnection.stl”

596 Additional Material 3: .3dm file for all components all the components of mask frame prototypes, annotated in
597 3D, “PanFab-MaskFrame-Assembled.3dm”

598