



**HAL**  
open science

## Experimental protocol to investigate particle aerosolization of a product under abrasion and under environmental weathering

Neeraj Shandilya, Olivier Le Bihan, Christophe Bressot, Martin Morgeneyer

### ► To cite this version:

Neeraj Shandilya, Olivier Le Bihan, Christophe Bressot, Martin Morgeneyer. Experimental protocol to investigate particle aerosolization of a product under abrasion and under environmental weathering. *Journal of visualized experiments: JoVE*, 2016, 115, pp.art. e53496. 10.3791/53496. ineris-01853059

**HAL Id: ineris-01853059**

**<https://ineris.hal.science/ineris-01853059>**

Submitted on 25 Sep 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **TITLE:**

2 **Experimental protocol to investigate particle aerosolization of a product under abrasion**  
3 **and under environmental weathering in view of ensuring its nanosafety-by-design**

4  
5 **AUTHORS**

6 Shandilya, Neeraj

7 Direction des Risques Chroniques

8 Institut National de l'Environnement Industriel et des Risques (INERIS)

9 Verneuil en Halatte, France

10  
11 Génie des Procédés Industriels

12 Université de Technologie de Compiègne (UTC)

13 Compiègne, France

14 [neeraj.shandilya@utc.fr](mailto:neeraj.shandilya@utc.fr)

15  
16 Le Bihan, Olivier

17 Direction des Risques Chroniques

18 Institut National de l'Environnement Industriel et des Risques (INERIS)

19 Verneuil en Halatte, France

20 [olivier.le-bihan@ineris.fr](mailto:olivier.le-bihan@ineris.fr)

21  
22 Bressot, Christophe

23 Direction de risques chroniques

24 Institut National de l'Environnement Industriel et des Risques (INERIS)

25 Verneuil en Halatte, France

26 [christophe.bressot@ineris.fr](mailto:christophe.bressot@ineris.fr)

27  
28 Morgeneuyer, Martin

29 Génie des Procédés Industriels

30 Université de Technologie de Compiègne (UTC)

31 Compiègne, France

32 [martin.morgeneuyer@utc.fr](mailto:martin.morgeneuyer@utc.fr)

33  
34 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR**

35 Morgeneuyer, Martin

36 Génie des Procédés Industriels

37 Université de Technologie de Compiègne (UTC)

38 Compiègne, France

39 [martin.morgeneuyer@utc.fr](mailto:martin.morgeneuyer@utc.fr)

40  
41 **KEY WORDS**

42 Nanomaterials, Particles; Nanosafety-by-design, Product design, Abrasion, Weathering,  
43 Emission, Aerosol

44  
45 **SHORT ABSTRACT**

46 In this article, results on the emission of engineered nanomaterials, in the form of aerosols are  
47 presented, once they are subjected to mechanical solicitation and environmental weathering.  
48 These results have been obtained using a specific experimental set-up which is described in  
49 details.

50

51

## 52 **LONG ABSTRACT**

53 The present article advocates the approach of nanosafety-by-design of nanostructured  
54 products for their durable development. This approach is basically a preemptive one in which  
55 the focus is put on minimizing the emission of engineered nanomaterials' aerosols during the  
56 usage phase of the product's life cycle. This can be attained by altering its material properties  
57 during its design phase without compromising with any of its added benefits. In this article,  
58 an experimental methodology is presented to investigate the nanosafety-by-design of three  
59 commercial nanostructured products through their mechanical solicitation and environmental  
60 weathering. The mean chosen for applying the mechanical solicitation is an abrasion process  
61 and for the environmental weathering, it is an accelerated UV exposure in the presence of  
62 humidity and heat. The eventual emission of engineered nanomaterials is studied in terms of  
63 their number concentration, size distribution, morphology and chemical composition. For the  
64 given test samples and experimental conditions, it was found that the application of the  
65 mechanical stresses alone emits the engineered nanomaterials' aerosols in which the  
66 engineered nanomaterial is always embedded inside the product matrix, thus, a representative  
67 product element. In such a case, the emitted aerosols comprise of both nanoparticles as well  
68 as microparticles. But if the mechanical stresses are coupled with the environmental  
69 weathering, then the eventual deterioration of the product, after a certain weathering duration,  
70 may lead to the emission of the free engineered nanomaterial aerosols too.

71

72

## 73 **INTRODUCTION**

74 With a rapid maturity in the nanotechnology, its advancement is driven by rapid  
75 commercialization of products containing *Engineered Nanomaterials* (ENM) with  
76 remarkable properties. As described by Potocnick<sup>1</sup> in the article 18(5) of Regulation  
77 1169/2011, issued by the European Commission, ENM can be defined as "any intentionally  
78 manufactured material, containing particles, in an unbound state or as an aggregate or as an  
79 agglomerate and where, for 50% or more of the particles in the number size distribution, one  
80 or more external dimensions is in the size range 1 nm to 100 nm". Moreover, the products  
81 containing ENM, either in their solid bulk or on their solid surfaces or in their liquid  
82 suspensions, can be termed as *Nanostructured products*. Different types of ENM with  
83 different formulations and functionalizations are used in such products according to the  
84 nature of application and budget. The products can be in the form of coatings, paints, tiles,  
85 house bricks, concrete etc.

86

87 As far as the research is concerned, one may also find enormous number of publications on  
88 the innovations that have been accomplished through nanotechnology. Despite this enormous  
89 research, the appealing traits of ENM are under probe for potential health or environmental  
90 dangers due to their tendency to get released or emitted in air in the form of aerosols during  
91 the use or processing of the nanostructures products (for example Oberdorster *et al.*<sup>2</sup>, Le  
92 Bihan *et al.*<sup>3</sup> and Houdy *et al.*<sup>4</sup>). Kulkarni *et al.*<sup>5</sup> defines an aerosol as the suspension of solid  
93 or liquid particles in the gaseous medium. Hsu and Chein<sup>6</sup> have demonstrated that during the  
94 use or processing of a nanostructured product, a nanostructured product is subjected to  
95 various mechanical stresses and *environmental weathering* which facilitate such an emission.

96

97 According to Maynard<sup>7</sup>, upon exposure, these aerosols of ENM may interact with human  
98 organism through inhalation or dermal contacts and get deposited inside the body which  
99 consequently may cause various detrimental effects, including the carcinogenic ones. Thus, a  
100 thorough understanding of the ENM emission phenomenon is of paramount importance given

101 the unprecedented use of nanostructured products, as mentioned by Shatkin *et al.*<sup>8</sup>. This may  
102 not only help in avoiding unanticipated health related complications arising from their  
103 *exposure* but also in encouraging public confidence in nanotechnologies.

104  
105 Nevertheless, the exposure related problem has now started getting attention by the research  
106 community and has been recently highlighted by various research units throughout the world  
107 (for example, Hsu and Chein<sup>6</sup>, Göhler *et al.*<sup>9</sup>, Allen *et al.*<sup>10</sup>, Allen *et al.*<sup>11</sup>, Al-Kattan *et al.*<sup>12</sup>,  
108 Kaegi *et al.*<sup>13</sup>, Hirth *et al.*<sup>14</sup>, Shandilya *et al.*<sup>15, 31, 33</sup>, Wohlleben *et al.*<sup>16</sup>, Bouillard *et al.*<sup>17</sup>,  
109 Ounoughene *et al.*<sup>18</sup>). Considering the large scale deployment of nanostructured products in  
110 the commercial markets, the most effective approach to tackle the problem would be a  
111 preemptive one. In such an approach, a product is designed in such a way that it is “nanosafe-  
112 by-design” or “Design for safer Nanotechnology” (Morose<sup>19</sup>) i.e. low emissive. In other  
113 words, it maximizes their benefits in problem solving during its use while emitting a  
114 minimum amount of aerosols in the environment.

115  
116 To test the nanosafety-by-design during the usage phase of a nanostructured product, the  
117 authors present an appropriate experimental methodology to do so in the present article. This  
118 methodology consists of two types of solicitations: (i) *mechanical* and (ii) *environmental*  
119 which aim at simulating the real life stresses to which the nanostructured product, a masonry  
120 brick, is subjected to during its usage phase.

121  
122 (i) A linear abrasion apparatus which simulates the mechanical solicitation. Its original and  
123 commercial form, as shown in figure 1 (a), is referenced in numerous internationally  
124 recognized test standards like ASTM D4060<sup>20</sup>, ASTM D6037<sup>21</sup> and ASTM D1044<sup>22</sup>.  
125 According to Golanski *et al.*<sup>23</sup>, due to its robust and user-friendly design, its original form is  
126 already being used widely in industries for analyzing the performance of products like paint,  
127 coating, metal, paper, textile, etc. The stress being applied through this apparatus corresponds  
128 to the typical one applied in a domestic setting, for example, walking with shoes and  
129 displacement of different objects in a household (Vorbau *et al.*<sup>24</sup> and Hassan *et al.*<sup>25</sup>). In  
130 figure 1 (a), a horizontally displacing bar moves the standard abradant in a to and fro motion  
131 over the sample surface. The abrasion wear occurs at the contact surface due to the friction at  
132 the contact. The magnitude of the abrasion wear can be varied by varying the normal load  
133 ( $F_N$ ) which acts at the top of the abradant. By changing the type of the abradant and normal  
134 load value, one may vary the abrasiveness and hence the mechanical stress. Morgeneyer *et al.*<sup>26</sup>  
135 have pointed out that the stress tensor to be measured during abrasion is composed of  
136 normal and tangential components. The normal stress is the direct result of the normal load,  
137 i.e. of  $F_N$  whereas the tangential stress is the result of the tangentially acting friction process,  
138 measured as force ( $F_T$ ) and it acts parallel or anti-parallel to the direction in which abrasion  
139 takes place. In the original form of this abrasion apparatus, one cannot determine  $F_T$ .  
140 Therefore, the role of the mechanical stresses during the aerosolization of ENM cannot  
141 completely be determined. To eradicate this limitation, as described in details by Morgeneyer  
142 *et al.*<sup>26</sup>, we have (a) modified it by replacing the already installed horizontal steel bar by a  
143 replica in aluminum 2024 alloy and (b) mounted a strain gauge on the top surface of this  
144 replicated aluminum alloy bar. This is shown in figure 1 (b). This strain gauge has 1.5 mm of  
145 active measuring grid length and 5.7 mm of measuring grid carrier length. It is made of a  
146 constantan foil having 3.8  $\mu\text{m}$  of thickness and  $1.95 \pm 1.5\%$  of gauge factor. A proper  
147 measurement of the mechanical stresses are ensured through a dynamic strain gauge amplifier  
148 which is connected in series to the strain gauge, thus allowing a reliable measurement of the  
149 strain produced in the gauge. The data transmitted via amplifier is acquired using a data  
150 acquisition software.

151

152 [Place figures 1 (a) (b) here]

153

154 In the figure 2, the complete experimental set-up is shown where this modified Taber  
155 abrasion apparatus is placed under the conformity of a nanosecured work post. A particle free  
156 air is constantly circulating inside this work post at a flow rate of 31000 l/min. It has a  
157 particle filter efficiency of 99.99% and has already been successfully employed by  
158 Morgeneyer *et al.*<sup>27</sup> in various nanoparticles' dustiness tests.

159

160 [Place figure 2 here]

161

162 The motor of the abrasion apparatus is kept outside and its linearly sliding part is kept inside  
163 a self-designed *emission test chamber*, with dimensions, 0.5 m × 0.3 m × 0.6 m, (details in Le  
164 Bihan *et al.*<sup>28</sup>). It helps in preventing the abrasion apparatus' motor emissions from  
165 interfering in the test results. The sampling of the generated aerosol particles is done inside  
166 the proximity of a radial symmetric hood (volume of 713 cm<sup>3</sup>). By employing such a hood,  
167 the aerosol particles losses due to their deposition on the surfaces can be minimized. The  
168 other advantage includes increase in the aerosol particles number concentration due to a  
169 relatively lower volume of the hood with respect to the emission test chamber. Thanks to this  
170 set up, a real time characterization and analysis of the particle aerosols getting generated  
171 during the abrasion wear can be done experimentally in terms of their *number concentrations*,  
172 *size distributions*, *elemental compositions* and *shapes*. According to Kulkarni *et al.*<sup>5</sup>, the  
173 number concentration of ENM aerosols can be defined as “the number of ENM present in  
174 unit cubic centimeter of air”. Similarly, the size distribution of ENM aerosols is “the  
175 relationship expressing the quantity of an ENM property (usually number and mass  
176 concentrations) associated with particles in a given size range”.

177

178 A ~~Condensation-Particle Counter (CPC; measurable size range: 4 nm to 3 μm)~~ measures the  
179 aerosol particles number concentration (*PNC*). ~~An-The Aerodynamic-Particle Sizers (APS;~~  
180 ~~measurable size range: 15 nm–20 μm) and-Scanning-Mobility-Particle-Sizer (SMPS;~~  
181 ~~measurable size range: 15–600 nm)~~ measure the particle size distribution (*PSD*). An aerosol  
182 particles sampler (described in details by R'mili *et al.*<sup>30</sup>) is used for the particle collection  
183 through filtration technique on a porous copper mesh grid which can be used later in  
184 Transmission Electron Microscope (TEM) for various qualitative analyses of the released  
185 particles.

186 (ii) The environmental solicitation can be simulated through accelerated artificial weathering  
187 in a weathering chamber, shown in figure 3. As shown by Shandilya *et al.*<sup>31</sup>, the weathering  
188 conditions can be kept in conformity with the international standards or be customized  
189 depending upon the type of simulation. The UV exposure is provided via xenon arc lamp  
190 (300–400 nm) installed with an optical radiation filter. The action of rain is simulated by  
191 spraying deionized and purified water onto them. A reservoir is placed beneath the test  
192 samples to collect the runoff water. The collected water or leachate can be used later to  
193 perform the ENM leaching analysis.

194

195 [Place figure 3 here]

196

## 197 **PROTOCOL**

198

199 NOTE: The technique presented in the Protocol here is not only limited to the presented test  
200 samples but can be used for other samples as well.

201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250

## 1. Artificial weathering [CEREGE platform, Aix en Provence]

1.1) Take a 250 ml sample of the deionized and purified water to be sprayed in a beaker. Immerse the tip of the water conductivity meter into the water. Note the water conductivity. Repeat the process and note the water conductivity each time.

NOTE: According to the *ISO 16474*<sup>32</sup>, it should never be higher than 5  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ .

1.2) After measuring the conductivity, connect the water source to the reservoir **of the weathering chamber** present underneath the stainless steel hood (shown in figure 3)-.

1.3) **Connect the overflow spout on the back of the chamber to a drain opening through a hose pipe.**

1.4) Place the nanocoating samples to weather (~~details are provided later in the Results section~~) **inside-into** the stainless steel hood and close the door. **To enable a statistical evaluation of the results, use a minimum of three identical nanocoating and reference samples.**

1.5) On the digital console, **present on the front of the weathering chamber**, select a two hours cycle composed of 120 min of UV light, 102 min dry and 18 min water spray.

1.6) **Enter the number of cycles equal to 2658 which corresponds to 7 months.**

1.7) **Choose the irradiance level of the xenon arc lamp equal to  $60 \pm 5 \text{ W}/\text{m}^2$ .**

1.8) **Set the ambient temperature at  $38^\circ\text{C}$ .**

1.9) **Start the weathering test by pressing the LAUNCH button on the console.**

## 2. Abrasion and ENM aerosols characterization [INERIS S-NANO Platform, Verneuil]

NOTE: Before using, ~~the particle aerosol characterizing instruments i.e. CPC, APS and SMPS, they are pre-verified~~ **verify the particle aerosol characterizing instruments** on a calibration bench of INERIS S-NANO Platform which comprises of separate and already installed reference counter parts. By following a specific protocol, ~~the-ensure that the~~ **instruments are ensured-to-be** working properly.

2.1) Assemble all the units and instruments shown in the experimental set-up and make the necessary connections as shown in figure 2 (details on the units and setting up of instruments are provided in Shandilya *et al.*<sup>33</sup>)

2.2) Switch on the circulation of the particle free air inside the nanosecured workpost by pressing the FLUX ON button.

2.3) Make this particle free air to pass through the emission test chamber by opening the chamber and keeping it open inside the nanosecured work post.

2.4) **To set up the experiment**~~In the present experimental set up,~~ **connect** the **CPC particle counter** ~~is~~ directly ~~connected~~ to the emission test chamber to measure the instantaneous number concentration of the particles inside the chamber. A digital console on the **CPC**

251 | **counter** shows the concentration value directly. While the particle free air is passing  
252 | through the chamber, continue to monitor this instantaneous number concentration  
253 | value until it drops to zero. In this way, **ensure that** the chamber ~~can be assured to be~~  
254 | free of any background particle.

255 |  
256 | 2.5) In the meantime, chamfer the edges of the standard cylindrically shaped abradant (~~6~~  
257 | ~~mm diameter with 2 cm length; SiC abrasive particles with an average size of 6 μm~~  
258 | ~~embedded in clay matrix~~) **by gently turning its one end in a to and fro motion inside**  
259 | **the slot using of** a tool provided with the abrasion apparatus.

260 |  
261 | 2.6) **Using a digital balance with a measurement precision of at least 0.001 g,** weigh  
262 | the abradant and sample to be abraded (~~three commercial nanostructured products in the~~  
263 | ~~present case) with a with a measurement precision of at least 0.001 g.~~

264 |  
265 | 2.7) Once done, fix the chamfered abradant to the vertical shaft of the abrasion apparatus  
266 | through a chuck present at its bottom.

267 |  
268 | 2.8) Place the nanostructured product to be abraded gently beneath the fixed abradant and  
269 | ~~make the necessary arrangements to~~ firmly fix its position **on the mounting system.**

270 |  
271 | 2.9) Open the aerosol sampler and, by using a tweezer, place a copper mesh grid inside the  
272 | slot with its brighter side upwards. Put a circular ring over the grid to fix it.

273 |  
274 | 2.10) Close the sampler and connect it to a pump via a filter on one end (i.e. towards darker  
275 | side of the grid) and to the particle source on the other end (i.e. towards brighter side of  
276 | the grid). Mount the required normal load on the vertical shaft using the dead weights.

277 |  
278 | 2.11) Through ~~CPC~~**the particle counter**, check if the background particles concentration  
279 | inside the open chamber has dropped to zero. If not, wait for it. If yes, close the door of  
280 | the emission test chamber.

281 |  
282 | 2.12) Via the digital consoles on the instruments, manually set the flow rates of ~~CPC the~~  
283 | ~~particle counter equal to 1.5 l/min with 1 s of sampling time, SMPS and the sizers~~  
284 | ~~equal to 0.3 l/min with 120 s of sampling time and APS equal to 5 l/min with 5 s of~~  
285 | ~~sampling time.~~

286 |  
287 | 2.13) Set the total sampling duration at 20 min for all these three instruments. Set the abrasion  
288 | duration and speed equal to 10 min and 60 cycles per minute respectively in the  
289 | abrasion apparatus.

290 |  
291 | 2.14) Connect the strain gauge to the dynamic strain gauge amplifier. Connect the dynamic  
292 | strain gauge amplifier to the computer which shall be used for the data acquisition using  
293 | software installed in it.

294 |  
295 | 2.15) Open the software.

296 |  
297 | 2.16) Click NEW DAQ PROJECT to open a new data acquisition file.

298 |  
299 | 2.17) Stop the option for live data acquisition by clicking LIVE UPDATE

300 |

- 301 2.18) Click 0 EXECUTE to set the reference signal value equal to zero.  
302
- 303 2.19) Switch back on the live data acquisition by clicking LIVE UPDATE.  
304
- 305 2.20) Click VISUALIZATION to choose the mode of data representation.  
306
- 307 2.21) Click NEW to open the templates.  
308
- 309 2.22) The option SCOPE PANEL can be chosen, for example.  
310
- 311 | 2.23) Start the data acquisition in ~~CPC, APS and SMPS~~ **the particle counters and sizers** at  
312 | once.  
313
- 314 2.24) After a delay of approx. 5 min, start the abrasion.  
315
- 316 2.25) Click START in the data acquisition software window to acquire the strain gauge  
317 | signals corresponding to the ongoing abrasion.  
318
- 319 2.26) After 2 min, switch on the pump connected to the MPS.  
320
- 321 2.27) Keep the pump running for 2-4 min depending upon the quantity of the emission of the  
322 | aerosol particles.  
323
- 324 2.28) Once the abrasion stops, switch off the data acquisition by clicking STOP.  
325
- 326 2.29) Save the acquired data by clicking SAVE DATA NOW  
327
- 328 | 2.30) After the **counter and sizers** ~~CPC, APS and SMPS~~ stop acquiring data, open the  
329 | emission test chamber and weigh again the abradant and abraded nanostructured  
330 | product.  
331
- 332 2.31) Continue the entire process for every abrasion test.  
333
- 334 2.32) Once the abrasion tests are done, the three particle aerosol characterizing instruments  
335 | are once again verified on the calibration bench of INERIS S-NANO Platform.  
336
- 337 **3. TEM analysis of the liquid suspensions- Drop deposition technique [INERIS**  
338 **calibration Platform, Verneuil]**
- 339 3.1) Prepare a 1% volume diluted aqueous solution of the liquid suspension by adding 1 part  
340 | of the suspension in 99 parts of the filtered and de-ionized water.  
341
- 342 3.2) Open the cover of the glow discharge machine  
343
- 344 3.3) Set the following operating conditions: 0.1 mbar, 45 mA, 3 min duration.  
345
- 346 3.4) In order to make a TEM copper mesh grid hydrophilic by its plasma treatment, put it on  
347 | the metal stand. Close the cover and start the motor. After 3 min, it stops automatically.  
348



349 3.5) Take out the hydrophilic turned mesh grid using a tweezer. Place it gently with its  
350 brighter side up. Deposit a drop of the diluted solution (8  $\mu$ l approx.) onto the  
351 hydrophilic mesh grid using a syringe.

352

353 3.6) Allow the mesh grid to dry in a closed chamber so that the water content gets  
354 evaporated and the constituent particles rest deposited on the grid. Make sure that the  
355 mesh grid doesn't get charged with the stray particles.

356

357 | 3.7) **Once ready, put the grid in the TEM probe and carry out the microscopic analysis.**

358

359 | 3.8) **If the grid appears too laden with particles to analyze, lower the dilution**  
360 **percentage and volume of the deposited drop. Modify the volume of the deposited**  
361 **drop depending on the particles number observed by TEM microscopy.** The maximum  
362 volume an operator is able to deposit is approximately equal to 12  $\mu$ l.

363

## 364 REPRESENTATIVE RESULTS

### 365 Test Samples

366 The protocols presented in the article were applied to three different commercial  
367 nanostructured products. A focus is put here on the details of the experimental approach:

368 (a) alumino-silicate brick reinforced with TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles, (11 cm x 5 cm x 2 cm). It finds  
369 its frequent application in constructing façades, house walls, wall tiles, pavements etc. Its  
370 material properties along with a scanning electron microscope image are shown in table 1 and  
371 figure 4 respectively.

372

373 *[Place figure 4 here]*

374 *[Place table 1 here]*

375

376 | (b) ~~Photocal Masonry and Tipe E502, P~~photocatalytic nanocoatings ~~.The two consisting~~ of  
377 anatase titanium dioxide nanoparticles with a PMMA **and alcoholic base** as dispersants  
378 **respectively in the former while an alcoholic base as dispersant in the latter.** The  
379 Transmission Electron Microscope (TEM) analysis of the two nanocoatings, shown in figures  
380 5 (a) and (b), reveal average TiO<sub>2</sub> particle size equal to  $8 \pm 4$  nm in the former case while  $25$   
381  $\pm 17$  nm in the latter. Also, two distinct phases contributed by the dispersant (in grey color)  
382 and incorporated TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles (in pitch black color) can also be observed. The volume  
383 percentages of titanium dioxide nanoparticles in the two nanocoatings are same and equal to  
384 1.1%. The Energy dispersive X-ray analysis (EDX) of the elemental composition of the two  
385 nanocoatings, obtained after following the protocol for the drop deposition technique, show  
386 similar observations i.e. C (60 to 65% in mass), O (15 to 20% in mass) and Ti (10 to 15% in  
387 mass). It should be noted that both nanocoatings are manufactured specifically for  
388 applications on external surfaces of the buildings which are generally porous like brick,  
389 concrete, etc. Therefore, the substrate chosen for the nanocoating application was a  
390 commercial plain masonry brick (11 cm  $\times$  5 cm  $\times$  5 cm).

391

392 *[Place figures 5 (a) and (b) here]*

393

394 | (c) ~~NANOBYK-3810, a t~~Transparent glaze additive **consisting of nanoparticles of CeO<sub>2</sub>**  
395 **having a primary size of 10 nm. It is dispersed in the glaze with 1.3% volume**  
396 **percentage. Such glaze which** is generally applied on externally lying painted wooden  
397 surfaces to impart protection towards their eventual discoloration and weathering with time.  
398 ~~It consists of nanoparticles of CeO<sub>2</sub> having a primary size of 10 nm and dispersed in the glaze~~

399 | ~~with 1.3% volume percentage.~~ In figures 6 (a) and (b), TEM image and elemental  
400 composition analysis of a sample drop are shown respectively.

401  
402 *[Place figures 6 (a) and (b) here]*

403

#### 404 **Emission from the nanostructured brick**

405 The evolution of the total worn mass of the nanostructured brick ( $M_t$ ) during abrasion is  
406 shown with respect to  $F_N$  in figure 7. For each value of  $F_N$ , the abrasion test has been  
407 repeated thrice. This evolution appears to follow a linear path up to  $F_N = 10.5$  N after which  
408 it unexpectedly increases for the higher loads. The standard deviations, measured in the  
409 values of the worn mass, range from 0 to 0.023 g. The worn mass of the abradant during each  
410 abrasion test was less than 2% that of the brick, therefore negligible.

411

412 *[Place figure 7 here]*

413

414 | In figure 8, the unimodal PSD of the emitted aerosol particles (~~as measured by SMPS and~~  
415 | ~~APS~~) are shown for different values of  $F_N$ . For each value, the abrasion test has been  
416 repeated thrice. With an increasing  $F_N$ , the mode of the PSD is also increasing. However,  
417 beyond 10.5 N, the number concentration peak or the maximum particle number  
418 concentration remains stagnant at  $\sim 645$  cm<sup>-3</sup>.

419

420 *[Place figure 8 here]*

421

422 In figure 9 (a), the evolution of the total PNC is shown with respect to  $F_N$ . For the particles  
423 | having sizes in the range of 20–500 nm (~~measured using SMPS~~), it appears to increase up to  
424 | 10.5 N after which it starts decreasing. For 0.5–20  $\mu$ m size range (~~measured using APS~~), it  
425 increases continuously. However, it seems to approach a constant value beyond 10.5 N.  
426 However, the behavior of total PNC with respect to the increasing  $F_T$ , shown in figure 9 (b) is  
427 different as it increases monotonously. A similar observation can be observed for the PSD  
428 modes too.

429

430 *[Place figures 9 (a) (b) here]*

431

432 For the TEM analysis of the sampled aerosol particles which were collected on a mesh grid  
433 during the abrasion at 4 different values of  $F_N$ , the sizes of 50 different aerosol particles were  
434 measured for each grid, and their average sizes were determined in each case. Table 2 shows  
435 the average values. A clear increase in the average size of the sampled aerosol particles can  
436 be seen with the increasing  $F_N$ .

437

438 *[Place table 2 here]*

439

#### 440 **Emission from the photocatalytic nanocoatings**

441 To test the emission of aerosol particles from the photocatalytic nanocoatings, abrasion tests  
442 of their weathered and non-weathered test samples were done. The results pertaining to their  
443 non-weathered samples are presented first. The PNC curves obtained when the 4 layered  
444 nanocoatings' test samples were abraded under a normal load of 6 N are shown in the figures  
445 10 (a). The test was repeated thrice under same conditions. For uncoated reference, the  
446 repetition was done on the same brick. In the figure 10 (a), the abrasion starts at  $t = 240$  s and  
447 ends at  $t = 840$  s. Before and after this time interval ( $t = 0$  to 240 s), the system is idle. The  
448 | nanocoating ~~Tipe E502~~ **with alcoholic base** seems to impart no difference on the PNC when

449 it is compared with the uncoated reference. The two have almost the same PNC levels. Since  
450 the nanocoating ~~E502~~ probably gets rubbed off completely without providing any resistance,  
451 the PNC attains its maximum value ( $\approx 200 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ) soon after the abrasion starts. The standard  
452 deviation ranges from 5 to  $16 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ . For the nanocoating ~~Photocatal~~with **PMMA**, the PNC is  
453 initially low ( $\approx 14 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ) due to a probable resistance of the nanocoating against abrasion.  
454 However, this resistance continues up to a certain point ( $t= 624 \text{ s}$ ) after which it may start  
455 getting rubbed off. As a result, the PNC starts increasing gradually. It attains the same value  
456 as for **the other** nanocoating ~~Type E502~~ or the reference towards the end of the abrasion. The  
457 standard deviation in the values measured for the nanocoating ~~Photocatal~~-with **PMMA** varies  
458 from 0.7 to  $27 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ .

459  
460 *[Place figures 10 (a) (b) here]*

461  
462 In figure 10 (b), the PSD of the emitted aerosol particles is shown. The nanocoating ~~Type~~  
463 ~~E502~~with **alcoholic base** seems to have no effect on the PSD either except the shift of the  
464 size mode towards smaller particle sizes ( $154 \pm 10 \text{ nm}$ ). The standard deviation in the PSD  
465 measured in this case changes from 0.2 to  $16 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ . The nanocoating ~~Photocatal~~-with **PMMA**  
466 considerably drops the peak of the PSD curve by a factor of  $\sim 30$  rendering the particle  
467 emission totally insignificant. The standard deviation measured here is  $8 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  maximum.

468  
469 In figure 11 (a), effect of increasing  $F_N$  has been shown on a 4 layered ~~Photocatal~~-nanocoating  
470 ~~sample~~with **PMMA**. The abrasion commences at  $t= 240 \text{ s}$  and ends at  $t= 840 \text{ s}$ . For a clear  
471 view of the PNC, between  $t= 240 \text{ s}$  and  $t= 480 \text{ s}$ , a zoomed view in figure 11 (a1) is also  
472 shown. The PNC increases with normal load. The same pattern continues in figure 11 (b) for  
473 a 4 layered ~~Type E502~~nanocoating **sample with the alcoholic base** too. While measuring the  
474 PSD ~~in case of Photocatal~~for the nanocoating with **PMMA**, the ~~SMPS and APS~~PSD showed  
475 very low concentrations which were even close to their particle detection thresholds. Hence,  
476 the two particle sizers were not employed further. But for ~~Type E502~~the nanocoating with  
477 **alcoholic base**, there were no such problems. ~~Thus, the PSD for Type E502 in this case~~ is  
478 shown in figure 11 (c). Three unimodal distributions with increasing size modes (i.e. 154 nm  
479 to 274 nm to 365 nm) and increasing concentration peaks can be seen for increasing normal  
480 loads.

481  
482 *[Place figures 11 (a), (a1), (b) and (c) here]*

483  
484 The number of layers also has a substantial effect on PNC. The figure 12 demonstrates this  
485 effect where two samples, having 2 and 4 layers of ~~Photocatal~~the nanocoating with **PMMA**,  
486 are tested for  $F_N= 6 \text{ N}$ . The abrasion commences at  $t= 240 \text{ s}$  and ends at  $t= 840 \text{ s}$ . The PNC is  
487 always lower when a 4 layered ~~sample of the nanocoating~~ (std. deviation: 2 to  $27 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ) is  
488 abraded as compared to the 2 layered ~~one~~ (std. deviation: 13 to  $37 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ) or an uncoated  
489 reference. Both sets of layers seem to provide resistance towards abrasion. However, in the  
490 case of ~~Type E502~~the nanocoating with **alcoholic base**, both 2 and 4 layered ~~samples~~ had  
491 similar PNC.

492  
493 *[Place figure 12 here]*

494  
495 The SEM observations of the 4 layered ~~Photocatal~~ ~~sample~~nanocoating with **PMMA** were also  
496 done at the end of the abrasion. The figure 13 shows the observation. An unabraded coated  
497 surface (marked A) had an average Ti content of  $\sim 12\%$  (in mass). For the abraded part

498 (marked B), the average Ti content lowers down to ~0% (in mass), thus, completely  
499 exposing the brick surface.

500

501 *[Place figure 13 here]*

502

503 Hence, a 4 layered ~~sample of Photocal~~ **nanocoating with PMMA** has performed remarkably  
504 well as compared to its 2 layered counterpart or ~~Type E502~~ **the other nanocoating**, including  
505 its both 2 and 4 layered ~~sed of nanocoatings~~ **samples**. Considering this observation, some 4  
506 layered samples of ~~Photocal of the nanocoating with PMMA~~ were also exposed to the  
507 artificial accelerated weathering prior to their abrasion. In figures 14 (a)-(e), one may see a  
508 deteriorating effect of the weathering ~~of the 4 layered Photocal sample~~. A continuous and  
509 integrated form of the nonweathered nanocoated ~~ing sample~~ can be observed in figure 14 (a).  
510 A progressive deterioration of the nanocoating via cracking can be then observed in the  
511 successive figures i.e. figures 14 (b), (c), (d) and (e). On the contrary, an uncoated reference  
512 ~~sample~~ shows no such effects. The drying stress due to water content evaporation and gradual  
513 embrittlement of the polymeric binder present in the nanocoating during its interaction with  
514 UV rays result in such a deterioration (White<sup>35</sup>, Murray<sup>36</sup>, Dufresne *et al.*<sup>37</sup>, Hare<sup>38</sup>  
515 Tirumkudulu and Russel<sup>39</sup>). The EDS analysis of the weathered nanocoated ~~ing sample~~  
516 ~~surfaces~~ via elemental mapping between Ti (contributed by the nanocoating) and Ca  
517 (contributed by the brick) is shown in figures 14 (f)-(j). In the figure, an almost stagnant Ti  
518 content on the surface (average value ~16.1%) can be observed with an increasing Ca  
519 content and hence the exposed surface. One of the major implications of this result can be the  
520 shrinkage of nanocoating with weathering.

521

522 *[Place figures 14 (a)-(j) here]*

523

524 The quantification of the TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles emission in the water was carried out at the  
525 intervals of 2, 4, 6 and 7 months of weathering. For this 100 ml samples of leachate were  
526 taken from the collected runoff water and analyzed using an Inductively Coupled Plasma  
527 Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS). Table 3 shows ICP-MS's operating conditions. We found that  
528 the Ti was found to be always below the threshold detection value (= 0.5 µg/l) in the sample  
529 volume. This observation leads to the conclusion that despite the deterioration by weathering,  
530 the ~~nanocoated sample surfaces are~~ **nanocoating is** still strongly bound to resist their leaching  
531 into the runoff waters.

532

533 *[Place table 3 here]*

534

535 The weathering was followed by the abrasion. ~~of both uncoated reference and nanocoated~~  
536 ~~samples of Photocal~~. The figures 15 (a) and (b) show the results of TEM analysis of the  
537 sampled aerosol particles, during the first 2 min of abrasion of the 4 and 7 months weathered  
538 ~~Photocal samples nanocoating~~ under the same sampling conditions. A qualitatively higher  
539 deposition of aerosol particles on the mesh grids can be observed in the case of latter. The  
540 polydispersed aerosol particles can be observed upon higher magnification. Even though we  
541 weren't able to quantify, but a significant amount of free nanoparticles of TiO<sub>2</sub> (i.e. Ti mass >  
542 90%) was observed when 7 months weathered ~~samples were~~ **nanocoating was** abraded  
543 (figure 15 (c) (d)). This result differs from the findings of non-weathered nanocoatings and  
544 various other studies like Shandilya *et al.*<sup>15</sup>, Golanski *et al.*<sup>23</sup>, Göhler *et al.*<sup>29</sup>, Shandilya *et*  
545 *al.*<sup>33</sup>. Hence, it is of more particular interest. In previously obtained results for non-weathered  
546 nanocoatings and other mentioned studies, a large fraction of the emitted aerosols composed  
547 of the nanomaterial in the matrix-bound state and not in the free state.

548

549 [Place figures 15 (a)-(e) here]

550

551 In the figure 15 (e), the variations in the percentages of the three elements- C, Ti and Ca are  
552 shown when the weathering duration reaches 7 months from 4 months. A clear effect of the  
553 polymer embrittlement can be observed with a drop in the C content from 56% to 12%. This  
554 drop directly implies the reduction in the presence of the matrix around the emitted aerosol  
555 particles. An increase from 7% to 55% in the Ti content signifies an increase of Ti  
556 concentration in the emitted aerosol particles. The exposed surface of the underlying brick,  
557 after 7 months of weathering, yields some aerosol particles too upon abrasion. As a result,  
558 some aerosol particles from the brick are also observed after 7 months of weathering.  
559 Hence, the weathering duration has a direct impact on the size and chemical composition of  
560 the aerosol particles.

561

562 [Place figures 16 (a)-(d) here]

563

564 The figures 16 (a)-(d) show the results on PNC and PSD of the aerosol particles sampled  
565 within the volume of the sampling hood. In figures 16 (a) and (b), starting at  $t=120$  s and  
566 continuing until  $t=720$  s, the abrasion of the uncoated reference ~~samples~~ yielded a constant  
567 and weathering duration independent PNC ( $\sim 500$   $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ; standard deviation  $5-16$   $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ;  
568 repeated thrice). Therefore, the artificial weathering has no apparent effect on emitted aerosol  
569 particles from the uncoated reference ~~sample~~. However, in the case of the **Photoeal**  
570 **nanoacoatings** ~~samples~~, a clear effect of the weathering duration can be observed as the PNC  
571 increases with weathering duration. Except for 6 and 7 months, the nature of its variation  
572 with time is also strikingly similar i.e. initial ascension, followed by stagnation, then  
573 ascension again, and the final stagnation. For 6 and 7 months ~~weathered samples~~, there is an  
574 immediate bump in the concentration as soon as the abrasion starts. This initial bump in the  
575 concentration is even higher than that of the reference ~~sample~~. However, after  $t=360$  s, it  
576 tends to come back to the ~~referencesame level as that of the reference sample~~. This  
577 difference in the nanocoating behavior with respect to the abrasion can be explained on the  
578 basis of its removal mechanism during abrasion. Until 4 months of the weathering, the  
579 nanocoating is believed to be strong enough to resist its abrasion. As a result, it gets *worn*  
580 slowly and hence, the number concentration of the emitted aerosols increases slowly.  
581 However, after 6 and 7 months of the weathering, the nanocoating is lumpy (as already seen  
582 in the figure 14 (e)) as possibly loosely attached to the brick's surface. As a result, as soon as  
583 the abrasion starts, these nanocoating lumps get *uprooted* easily which shows a bump in the  
584 number concentration of the emitted aerosol particles. The PSD of the emitted aerosol  
585 particles for the reference ~~sample~~ (figure 16 (c)) shows no apparent effect of the weathering  
586 (mode alternating between 250 and 350 nm; PNC  $\approx 375$   $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ; standard deviation  $0.2-8$   $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ).  
587 In figure 16 (d), the particle size distribution is shown for the **Photoeal-nanocoats** ~~samples~~  
588 that correspond to the first phase during which the EAPNC is stagnant. This figure does not  
589 show any curve for 6 and 7 months ~~weathering test samples~~ because there is no first  
590 stagnant phase for them. As one may see clearly, there is an increase in the size mode as well  
591 as maximum EAPNC.

592

### 593 **Emission from the glaze**

594 Contrary to the aerosol particles emission observations in the case of the reinforced bricks  
595 and photocatalytic nanocoatings, the two layers ~~of glazed wooden samples~~ were found to be  
596 non-emissive during their abrasion when  $F_N=6$  N. The number concentration of the emitted

597 | aerosol particles, obtained using ~~CPC-3775~~the particle counter, was always found to be less  
598 | than  $1 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ , hence insignificant.

599

600 | **FIGURE LEGENDS:**

601 | **Figure 1:** The original form of Taber 5750 linear abrasion apparatus (b) the replica of the  
602 | steel bar in aluminum mounted with the strain gauge at top

603

604 | **Figure 2:** Experimental set-up (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>31</sup>)

605

606 | **Figure 3:** Suntest XLS+ weathering chamber

607

608 | **Figure 4:** SEM image of the nanostructured alumino-silicate brick (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>33</sup>)

609

610 | **Figure 5:** TEM analyses of the morphology of the nanoparticles present in **the nanocoating**  
611 | **with** (a) ~~Photocal-Masonry~~<sup>®</sup>-PMMA and (b) ~~Tipe-E502~~<sup>®</sup>alcoholic base as dispersant  
612 | (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>33</sup>)

613

614 | **Figure 6:** (a) TEM and (b) Elemental composition analysis of NANOBYK-3810

615

616 | **Figure 7:** Variation of the total worn mass of the brick with increasing normal load  
617 | (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>33</sup>)

618

619 | **Figure 8:** Particle size distribution (PSD) of the emitted aerosol particles as a function of  
620 | normal load (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>33</sup>)

621

622 | **Figure 9:** (a) Total emitted aerosol particles number concentration (PNC) of the aerosol  
623 | particles as a function of normal load (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>34</sup>) (b) Total PNC and PSD mode as a  
624 | function of tangential load

625

626 | **Figure 10:** (a) PNC variation with time (b) PSD of the aerosol particles emitted during the  
627 | abrasion of 4 ~~layered-layers of the~~ nanocoating-samples under 6 N of normal load (note: all  
628 | the curves are mean curves obtained from 3 repeated tests) (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>33</sup>)

629

630 | **Figure 11:** (a) PNC variation with time for 4 ~~layereds of Photocal-nanocoating with PMMA~~  
631 | ~~and (b) Tipe-E502-samplealcoholic base~~; (a1) zoomed view; (c) PSD of the aerosol particles  
632 | emitted during the abrasion of 4 ~~layered-layers of Tipe-E502-samplenanocoating with~~  
633 | ~~alcoholic base~~ (note: all the curves are mean curves obtained from 3 repeated tests)  
634 | (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>33</sup>)

635

636 | **Figure 12:** PNC variation with time for 2 and 4 ~~layeresed of Photocal-samples-nanocoating~~  
637 | ~~with PMMA~~ (note: all the curves are mean curves obtained from 3 repeated tests) (Shandilya  
638 | *et al.*<sup>33</sup>)

639

640 | **Figure 13:** SEM image and EDX analysis of the coated and abraded parts of the ~~Photocal~~  
641 | ~~nanocoating with PMMA~~sample; part (A): unabraded coated surface; part (B): abraded  
642 | (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>33</sup>)

643

644 | **Figure 14:** Microscopic analysis of progressively deteriorating ~~Photocal-samplenanocoating~~  
645 | (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>31</sup>)

646

647 **Figure 15:** TEM image of aerosol particles emitted from the abrasion of (a) 4 months and (b)  
648 7 months weathered **Photoeal-nanocoatingsamples** (c, d) free nanoparticles emitted from the  
649 abrasion of 7 months weathered **Photoeal-samples-nanocoating** (e) Chemical analysis of  
650 aerosol particles emitted from the abrasion of 4 and 7 months weathered **Photoeal**  
651 **samplesnanocoating** (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>31</sup>)

652  
653 **Figure 16:** PNC and PSD during the abrasion of weathered reference and **Photoeal**  
654 **nanocoatingsamples**. The abrasion takes place for  $t = 120-720$  s in panels (a) and (b).  
655 (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>31</sup>)

656  
657 **Table 1:** Material properties of the nanostructured alumino-silicate brick

658  
659 **Table 2:** Average aerosol particle size of the sampled aerosol particles at different values of  
660  $F_N$

661  
662 **Table 3:** Operating conditions of ICP-MS

## 663 **DISCUSSION:**

664  
665 In the present article, an experimental investigation of the nanosafety-by-design of  
666 commercial nanostructured products is presented. The nanosafety-by-design of any product  
667 can be studied in terms of its PNC and PSD when it is subjected to mechanical stresses and  
668 environmental weathering. The products chosen for the study are alumino-silicate brick  
669 reinforced with  $\text{TiO}_2$  nanoparticles, **glaze with  $\text{CeO}_2$  nanoparticles** and **photocatalytic**  
670 **nanocoatings with  $\text{TiO}_2$  nanoparticles** i.e. **Photoeal Masonry<sup>®</sup> & Tipe<sup>®</sup> E502**. These products  
671 are easily accessible to the customers in the commercial market and well associated with their  
672 daily lives. Therefore, their investigation towards their nanosafety-by-design is crucial.

673  
674  
675 During the abrasion of the nanostructured brick, a critical role of the normal load,  $F_N$ , was  
676 observed in terms of PNC and PSD. With an increase in its value, the average size of the  
677 emitted aerosol particles increases too. When  $F_N \leq 10.5$  N, the emitted aerosol particles are  
678 mainly composed of smaller sized aerosol particles ( $< 365$  nm). Beyond 10.5 N, more and  
679 bigger-sized aerosol particles start being generated. In the latter case, most of the emitted  
680 aerosol particles have more tendency to deposit on the surface as debris rather than to  
681 aerosolize. Hence, after increasing initially, the PNC either decreases or attains a constant  
682 value beyond a critical value. Considering such a critical role,  $F_N = 10.5$  N can be termed as  
683 *critical normal load* value of  $F_N$  i.e.  $(F_N)_{cr}$ . The authors believe that the value of  $(F_N)_{cr}$  is  
684 exclusively material dependent. However, further tests are still to be carried out to confirm  
685 this hypothesis.

686  
687 It is well known that any solid surface is composed of the microscopic identities or waviness  
688 which induce roughness to it. They are called surface *asperities*. Each individual asperity is in  
689 contact with each other. Considering this fact, one may hypothesize that when the value of  
690  $F_N$  is lower than  $(F_N)_{cr}$ , the fracturing of the surface asperities takes place in such a way that  
691 it favors the generation of lower wear mass and smaller-sized particles. Such a case can be  
692 imagined if the fracture passes through the asperity, thus, disintegrating it in a number of  
693 smaller fragments. This can be compared with a *trans-granular fracture* in crystalline solids.  
694 But when  $F_N$  is higher than  $(F_N)_{cr}$ , the fracturing of the surface asperities take place in such a  
695 way that it favors the generation of higher wear mass and bigger-sized aerosol particles. The  
696 concentration of the smaller-sized aerosol appears to either remain constant or decrease. Such

697 a case can be imagined if the fracture passes along the boundary of the asperities, thus,  
698 cutting them out of the surface. This can be compared with an *inter-granular fracture* in  
699 crystalline solids.

700

701 Opposite to the brittle fracture behavior of the brick surface asperities, the porous fibrous  
702 nature of the glazed wooden surfaces has a porosity dependent emission behavior, as  
703 explained by Shandilya *et al.*<sup>40</sup>. The non emissivity of these test samples is in direct  
704 agreement with the simulated insignificant emissions obtained in Shandilya *et al.*<sup>41</sup>.

705

706 During the abrasion of the two non-weathered photocatalytic nanocoatings, we found that the  
707 emitted ENM are never in their pristine form, but rather embedded inside the dispersant  
708 matrix of the nanocoating. Based on the results, we also conclude that one may achieve the  
709 reduction in the PNC or ENM release from the nanocoatings by following either of the two or  
710 both remedies: (a) selection of a product having good interfacial adhesion with the substrate;  
711 (b) increase in the number of coating layers on the substrate. A coating on the surface is  
712 believed to act like a resistor to the externally applied mechanical stress which reduces its net  
713 impact. By increasing the number of the coating layers, the resistance effect further improves.  
714 Also, the surface energy, one of the key parameters affecting PNC, as identified by Shandilya  
715 *et al.*<sup>40</sup>, lowers with increasing number of the layers. Since the surface energy is directly  
716 proportional to the number of the released particles (Shandilya *et al.*<sup>41</sup>), therefore, its  
717 lowering leads to the reduction in PNC.

718

719 The environmental weathering, simulated via accelerated artificial weathering, was found to  
720 have a strong effect on the changes in the material properties. Hence, it also plays an  
721 important role in deciding the nature and quantity of PNC or released ENM. In the literature  
722 as well as in the present work, the environmental weathering is observed to bring  
723 deterioration of the product matrix. However, the extent of this deterioration depends upon  
724 the type of the matrix and duration of the weathering. During the course of the experiments, it  
725 is constantly observed that the occurrence of the ENM inside a matrix, during emission,  
726 continues until the matrix has a high interfacial shear strength value. With increasing  
727 weathering duration, there is a step-wise structural deterioration of the nanocoating which  
728 leads to the decrease in the interfacial shear strength between the matrix and the ENM. As a  
729 result, the emission of free ENM starts occurring. In such a case, if there is a flow of water  
730 over the surface, known as runoff, the leaching of these ENM in the runoff water is highly  
731 probable (although not observed in the present case but it is still probable for higher  
732 weathering durations). With a high specific surface area, these free ENM now accentuate a  
733 potential risk in terms of *nano-toxicity*.

734

735 | ~~One of the~~ **The Unique Selling Proposition** significance of our contribution towards a  
736 Nanosafety-by-design approach in studying the emission of nanoparticles during their  
737 product lifetime is that it focuses on finding a weathering duration threshold beyond which  
738 the chosen nanocoating has exceeded its nanosafe lifetime. (In the present case, it's 4 months  
739 of accelerated weathering.) This is done through a continuous monitoring of the in-process  
740 nanocoating state which allowed us to note the exact duration in which the nanocoating  
741 started to deteriorate. This is the feature which distinguishes it from previous scientific  
742 studies as they deal with the concept of the environmental weathering by applying it on a test  
743 sample for a predetermined duration with no in-process monitoring of the ongoing  
744 weathering. The approach chosen in the study presented here allows for quantitatively  
745 comparing experimentally measured nanosafety thresholds (i.e. nanosafe lifetimes) of



746 different –but similar- nanoproducts (under similar accelerated life conditions). It is thus the  
747 first step developing products on a Nanosafety-by-design basis.

748  
749 **A major limitation of the protocol presented for the ENM aerosols characterization is**  
750 **that a fraction of these ENM aerosols get lost before they can be characterized for their**  
751 **size and number. Such a loss can be attributed to various phenomena associated with**  
752 **the aerosol dynamics like sedimentation, diffusion, turbulence in the air flow, inertial**  
753 **deposition etc. which act on an aerosol particle simultaneously as soon as it gets emitted.**  
754 **This loss is a direct function of the aerosol particle size. This aspect has been considered**  
755 **in some previous publications like Shandilya *et al.*<sup>31</sup>, Shandilya *et al.*<sup>33</sup>, Shandilya *et al.*<sup>34</sup>.**  
756 **However, the consideration approach has been reactive in these studies i.e. calculations**  
757 **were done to approximately estimate the loss and the final experimental results were**  
758 **modified on the basis of the calculation results. In the case of a preemptive approach,**  
759 **the experimental set-up should be modified accordingly to minimize the loss so that a**  
760 **complete and accurate quantitative study of the emitted aerosol particles can be done.**  
761 **This shall be the focus of our future studies.**

#### 762 763 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:**

764 This work was carried out in the framework of the Labex SERENADE (ANR-11-LABX-  
765 0064) and the A\*MIDEX Project (ANR-11-IDEX-0001-02), funded by the French  
766 Government program, Investissements d’Avenir, and managed by the French National  
767 Research Agency (ANR). We thank the French Ministry of Environment (DRC 33 and  
768 Program 190) and ANSES (Nanodata Project 2012/2/154, APR ANSES 2012) for financing  
769 the work. We are equally grateful to Olivier Aguerre-Chariol, Patrice Delalain, Morgane  
770 Dalle, Laurent Meunier, Pauline Molina, and Farid Ait-Ben-Ahmad for their cooperation and  
771 advice during the experiments.

#### 772 773 **DISCLOSURE:**

774 The authors have nothing to disclose.

#### 775 776 **REFERENCES:**

- 777 1. Potocnick, J., European Commission Recommendation on the definition of  
778 nanomaterial. **2011/696/EU**, **Oct**(2011).
- 779 2. Oberdorster, G., Oberdorster, E., Oberdorster, J. Nanotoxicology: an emerging  
780 discipline evolving from studies of ultrafine particles. *Environmental Health*  
781 *Perspectives*, **113** (7), 823-839, **doi: [10.1289/ehp.7339](https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.7339)**, (2005).
- 782 3. Le Bihan, O., Shandilya, N., Gheerardyn, L., Guillon, O., Dore, E., Morgeneyer, M.  
783 Investigation of the Release of Particles from a Nanocoated Product. *Advances in*  
784 *Nanoparticles*, **2** (1), 39–44, **doi: [10.4236/anp.2013.21008](https://doi.org/10.4236/anp.2013.21008)**, (2013).
- 785 4. Houdy, P., Lahmani, M., Marano, F. *Nanoethics and Nanotoxicology*. Springer,  
786 Heidelberg, Germany, 1st edition, (2011).
- 787 5. Kulkarni, P., Baron, P. A., Willeke, K. *Aerosol Measurement: Principle, Techniques*  
788 *and Applications*. John Wiley and Sons, Hoboken, NJ, USA, 3rd edition, (2011).
- 789 6. Hsu, L.Y., Chein, H.M. Evaluation of nanoparticle emission for TiO<sub>2</sub> nanopowder  
790 coating materials. *Nanoparticle Research*, **9** (1), 157–163, **doi: [10.1007/s11051-006-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11051-006-9185-3)**  
791 **[9185-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11051-006-9185-3)**, (2007).

- 792 7. Maynard, A.D. Safe handling of nanotechnology. *Nature*, **444** (1), 267-269, doi:  
793 [10.1038/444267a](https://doi.org/10.1038/444267a), (2006).
- 794 8. Shatkin, J.A. *et al.* Nano risk analysis: advancing the science for nanomaterials risk  
795 management. *Risk Analysis*, **30** (11), 1680-1687, doi: [10.1111/j.1539-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01493.x)  
796 [6924.2010.01493.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01493.x), (2011).
- 797 9. Göhler, D., Nogowski, A., Fiala, P., Stintz, M. Nanoparticle release from  
798 nanocomposites due to mechanical treatment at two stages of the life-cycle. *Phys Conf*  
799 *Ser*, **429** 012045, DOI: [10.1088/1742-6596/429/1/012045](https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/429/1/012045), (2013).
- 800 10. Allen, N.S. *et al.*, ~~Edge, M., Corrales, T., Childs, A., Liauw, C.M., Catalina, F.,~~  
801 ~~Peinado, C., Minihan, A., Alderof, D.~~ Ageing and stabilisation of filled polymers: an  
802 overview. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*, **61** (2), 183-199, doi: [10.1016/S0141-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0141-3910(97)00114-6)  
803 [3910\(97\)00114-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0141-3910(97)00114-6), (2004).
- 804 11. Allen, N.S. , ~~Edge, M., Ortega, A., Sandoval, G., Liauw, C.M., Verran, J., Stratton, J.,~~  
805 ~~McIntyre, R.~~ *Bet al.* Degradation and stabilisation of polymers and coatings: nano  
806 versus pigmentary titania particles. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*, **85** (3), 927-946,  
807 doi: [10.1016/j.polymdegradstab.2003.09.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymdegradstab.2003.09.024), (2004).
- 808 12. Al-Kattan, A. *et al.*, ~~Wichser, A., Vonbank, R., Brunner, S., Ulrich, A., Zuind, S.,~~  
809 ~~Nowack B.~~ Release of TiO<sub>2</sub> from paints containing pigment-TiO<sub>2</sub> or nano-TiO<sub>2</sub> by  
810 weathering. *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts*, **15** (12), 2186-2193,  
811 doi: [10.1039/C3EM00331K](https://doi.org/10.1039/C3EM00331K), (2013).
- 812 13. Kaegi, R. , ~~Ulrich, A., Sinnet, B., Vonbank, R., Wichser, A., Zuleeg, S., Simmler, H.,~~  
813 ~~Brunner, S., Vonmont, H., Burkhardt, M., Boller, M.~~ *et al.* Synthetic TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticle  
814 emission from exterior facades into the aquatic environment. *Environmental Pollution*.  
815 **156** (2), 233- 239, 2008.
- 816 14. Hirth, S., Cena, L., Cox, G., Tomovic, Z., Peters, T., Wohlleben, W. Scenarios and  
817 methods that induce protruding or released CNTs after degradation of nanocomposite  
818 materials. *Nanoparticle Research*, **15** (2), 1504-1518, doi: [10.1007/s11051-013-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11051-013-1504-x)  
819 [1504-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11051-013-1504-x), (2013).
- 820 15. Shandilya, N., Le Bihan, O., Morgener, M. A review on the study of the generation of  
821 (nano-) particles aerosols during the mechanical solicitation of materials. *J.*  
822 *Nanomaterials*, No. **289108**, doi: [10.1155/2014/289108](https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/289108), (2014).
- 823 16. Wohlleben, W. *et al.*, ~~Brill, S., Meier, M.W., Mertler, M., Cox, G., Hirth, S., von~~  
824 ~~Vacano, B., Strauss, V., Treumann, S., Wiench, K., Ma Höck, L., Landsiedel, R.~~ On the  
825 lifecycle of nanocomposites: comparing released fragments and their in vivo hazards  
826 from three release mechanisms and four nanocomposites. *Small*, **7** (16), 2384-2395,  
827 doi: [10.1002/smll.201002054](https://doi.org/10.1002/smll.201002054), (2011).
- 828 17. Bouillard, J. X., ~~R'Mili, B., Moranviller, D., Vignes, A., Le Bihan, O., Ustache, A.,~~  
829 ~~Bomfim, J. A. S., Frejafon, E., Fleury, D.~~ *et al.* Nanosafety by design: risks from  
830 nanocomposite/nano waste combustion. *Journal of Nanoparticle Research*, **15** (1),  
831 1519-1529, doi: [10.1007/s11051-013-1519-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11051-013-1519-3), (2013).
- 832 18. Ounoughene, G. , ~~Le Bihan, O., Chivas Joly, C., Motzkus, C., Longuet, C., Debray, B.,~~  
833 ~~Joubert, A., Le Coq, L., Lopez-Cuesta, J.~~ *Met al.* Behavior and fate of Halloysite  
834 Nanotubes (HNTs) when incinerating PA6/HNTs nanocomposite. *Environmental*  
835 *Science & Technology*, **49** (9), 5450-5457, doi: [10.1021/es505674j](https://doi.org/10.1021/es505674j), (2015).

- 836 19. Morose, G. The 5 principles of “Design for Safer Nanotechnology”. *Journal of Cleaner*  
837 *Production*, **18** (3), 285–289, doi: [10.1016/j.jclepro.2009.10.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2009.10.001), (2010).
- 838 20. ASTM International, Standard test method for the abrasion of organic coatings by the  
839 Taber abradant. **ASTM D4060**, (2007).
- 840 21. ASTM International, Standard test methods for dry abrasion mar resistance of high  
841 gloss coatings. **ASTM D6037**, (1996).
- 842 22. ASTM International, Standard test method for resistance of transparent plastics to  
843 surface abrasion. **ASTM D1044**, (2008).
- 844 23. Golanski, L., Guiot, A., Pras, M., Malarde, M., Tardif, F. Release-ability of nano fillers  
845 from different nanomaterials (toward the acceptability of nanoproduit). *Nanoparticle*  
846 *Research*, **14** (1), article-962-970, doi: [10.1007/s11051-012-0962-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11051-012-0962-x), (2012).
- 847 24. Vorbau, M., Hillemann, L., Stintz, M. Method for the characterization of the abrasion  
848 induced nanoparticle release into air from surface coatings. *Journal of Aerosol Science*,  
849 **40** (3), 209–217, doi: [10.1016/j.jaerosci.2008.10.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2008.10.006), (2009).
- 850 25. Hassan, M.M., Dylla, H., Mohammad, L.N., Rupnow, T. Evaluation of the durability of  
851 titanium dioxide photocatalyst coating for concrete pavement. *Construction and*  
852 *Building Materials*, **24** (8), 1456–1461, doi: [10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2010.01.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2010.01.009),  
853 (2010).
- 854 26. Morgeneuyer, M., Shandilya, N., Chen, Y.M., Le Bihan, O. Use of a modified Taber  
855 abrasion apparatus for investigating the complete stress state during abrasion and in-  
856 process wear particle aerosol generation. *Chemical Engineering Research & Design*, **93**  
857 (1), 251–256, doi: [10.1016/j.cherd.2014.04.029](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cherd.2014.04.029), (2015).
- 858 27. Morgeneuyer, M., Le Bihan, O., Ustache, A., Aguerre Chariol, O. Experimental study of  
859 the aerosolization of fine alumina particles from bulk by a vortex shaker. *Powder*  
860 *Technology*, **246** (1), 583-589, doi: [10.1016/j.powtec.2013.05.040](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.powtec.2013.05.040), (2013).
- 861 28. Le Bihan, O., Morgeneuyer, M., Shandilya, N., Aguerre Chariol, O., Bressot, C. Chapt.  
862 7, In *Handbook of Nanosafety: Measurement, Exposure and Toxicology*. (Eds.) Vogel,  
863 U., Savolainen, K., Wu, Q., Van Tongeren, M., Brouwer, D., Berges, M. Academic  
864 Press, San Diego, CA, (2014).
- 865 29. Göhler, D., Stintz, M., Hillemann, L., Vorbau, M. Characterization of nanoparticle  
866 release from surface coatings by the simulation of a sanding process. *Annals of*  
867 *Occupational Hygiene*, **54** (6), 615–624, doi: [10.1093/annhyg/meq053](https://doi.org/10.1093/annhyg/meq053), (2010).
- 868 30. R’мили, B., Le Bihan, O., Dutouquet, C., Aguerre Charriol, O., Frejafon, E. Sampling by  
869 TEM grid filtration. *Aerosol Science and Technology*, **47** (7), 767–775, doi:  
870 [10.1080/02786826.2013.789478](https://doi.org/10.1080/02786826.2013.789478), (2013).
- 871 31. Shandilya, N., Le Bihan, O., Bressot, C., Morgeneuyer, M. Emission of Titanium  
872 Dioxide Nanoparticles from Building Materials to the Environment by Wear and  
873 Weather. *Environmental Science and Technology*, **49** (4), 2163–2170, doi:  
874 [10.1021/es504710p](https://doi.org/10.1021/es504710p), (2015).
- 875 32. AFNOR, Paints and varnishes – Methods of exposure to laboratory light sources – Part  
876 1: General guidance. **ISO 16474-1**, (2012).
- 877 33. Shandilya, N., Le Bihan, O., Bressot, C., Morgeneuyer, M. Evaluation of the particle  
878 aerosolization from n-TiO<sub>2</sub> photocatalytic nanocoatings under abrasion, *J.*  
879 *Nanomaterials*, No. **185080**, (2014).

- 880 34. Shandilya, N., Le Bihan, O., Morgeneyer, M. Effect of the Normal Load on the release  
881 of aerosol wear particles during abrasion. *Tribology Letters*, **55** (2), 227-234, doi:  
882 [10.1007%2Fs11249-014-0351-y](https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs11249-014-0351-y), (2014).
- 883 35. White, L. R. Capillary rise in powders. *J. Colloid Interface Science*, **90** (2), 536-538,  
884 doi: [10.1016/0021-9797\(82\)90319-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9797(82)90319-8), (1982).
- 885 36. Murray, M. Cracking in coatings from colloidal dispersions: An industrial perspective.  
886 Proceedings Rideal Lecture, London, April 20, 2009.  
887 [http://www.soci.org/~media/Files/Conference%20Downloads/2009/Rideal%20Lec](http://www.soci.org/~media/Files/Conference%20Downloads/2009/Rideal%20Lectures%20Apr%2009/Murray.ashx)  
888 [tures%20Apr%2009/Murray.ashx](http://www.soci.org/~media/Files/Conference%20Downloads/2009/Rideal%20Lectures%20Apr%2009/Murray.ashx)
- 889 37. Dufresne, E.R. , ~~Corwin, E.I., Greenblatt, N.A., Ashmore, J., Wang, D.Y., Dinsmore,~~  
890 ~~A.D., Cheng, J.X., Xie, X.S., Hutchinson, J.W., Weitz, D.~~ *et al.* Flow and fracture in  
891 drying nanoparticle suspensions, *Physics Review Letters*, **91**, No. 224501, doi:  
892 [10.1103/PhysRevLett.91.224501](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.91.224501), (2003).
- 893 38. Hare, C.H. The degradation of coatings by ultraviolet light and electromagnetic  
894 radiation, *J. Protective Coatings and Linings*, (1992)  
895 [http://www.q-lab.com/documents/public/70ccb209-bf41-4da0-bb80-](http://www.q-lab.com/documents/public/70ccb209-bf41-4da0-bb80-964d597fc728.pdf)  
896 [964d597fc728.pdf](http://www.q-lab.com/documents/public/70ccb209-bf41-4da0-bb80-964d597fc728.pdf)
- 897 39. Tirumkudulu, M.S., Russel, W.B. Cracking in drying latex films, *Langmuir*, **21** (11),  
898 4938-4948, doi: [10.1021/la048298k](https://doi.org/10.1021/la048298k), (2005).
- 899 40. Shandilya, N., Morgeneyer, M., Le Bihan, O. First development to model aerosol  
900 emission from solid surfaces subjected to mechanical stresses: I. Development and  
901 results. *Journal of Aerosol Science*, 2015 (submitted)
- 902 41. Shandilya, N., Morgeneyer, M., Le Bihan, O. First development to model aerosol  
903 emission from solid surfaces subjected to mechanical stresses: II. Experiment-Theory  
904 comparison, simulation and sensibility analysis. *Journal of Aerosol Science*, 2015  
905 (submitted)