



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

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

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

27
28 Morgeneuyer, Martin

29 Génie des Procédés Industriels

30 Université de Technologie de Compiègne (UTC)

31 Compiègne, France

32 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

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 Potocnick¹ 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.*², Le
92 Bihan *et al.*³ and Houdy *et al.*⁴). Kulkarni *et al.*⁵ defines an aerosol as the suspension of solid
93 or liquid particles in the gaseous medium. Hsu and Chein⁶ 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 Maynard⁷, 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.*⁸. 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 Chein⁶, Göhler *et al.*⁹, Allen *et al.*¹⁰, Allen *et al.*¹¹, Al-Kattan *et al.*¹²,
108 Kaegi *et al.*¹³, Hirth *et al.*¹⁴, Shandilya *et al.*^{15, 31, 33}, Wohlleben *et al.*¹⁶, Bouillard *et al.*¹⁷,
109 Ounoughene *et al.*¹⁸). 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” (Morose¹⁹) 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 D4060²⁰, ASTM D6037²¹ and ASTM D1044²².
125 According to Golanski *et al.*²³, 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.*²⁴ and Hassan *et al.*²⁵). 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*
135 *al.*²⁶ 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.*²⁶, 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 μm 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.*²⁷ 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.*²⁸). 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 cm³). 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.*⁵, 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.*³⁰) 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.*³¹, 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*³², 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°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.*³³)

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 μl 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 μl .

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_2 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_2 particle size equal to 8 ± 4 nm in the former case while 25
381 ± 17 nm in the latter. Also, two distinct phases contributed by the dispersant (in grey color)
382 and incorporated TiO_2 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_2**
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_2 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 ~ 645 cm⁻³.

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 μ 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 cm^{-3} . For the nanocoating ~~Photocel~~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 ~~Photocel~~-with **PMMA** varies
458 from 0.7 to 27 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 cm^{-3} . The nanocoating ~~Photocel~~-with **PMMA**
466 considerably drops the peak of the PSD curve by a factor of ~ 30 rendering the particle
467 emission totally insignificant. The standard deviation measured here is 8 cm^{-3} maximum.

468
469 In figure 11 (a), effect of increasing F_N has been shown on a 4 layered ~~Photocel~~-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 Photocel~~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 ~~Photocel~~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 cm^{-3}) is
488 abraded as compared to the 2 layered ~~one~~ (std. deviation: 13 to 37 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 ~~Photocel~~ ~~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 (White³⁵, Murray³⁶, Dufresne *et al.*³⁷, Hare³⁸
515 Tirumkudulu and Russel³⁹). 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 TiO₂ 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 TiO₂ (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.*¹⁵, Golanski *et al.*²³, Göhler *et al.*²⁹, Shandilya *et*
545 *al.*³³. 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 (~ 500 cm^{-3} ; standard deviation $5\text{--}16$ 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 ≈ 375 cm^{-3} ; standard deviation $0.2\text{--}8$ 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 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.*³¹)

605

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

607

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

609

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

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.*³³)

618

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

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.*³⁴) (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.*³³)

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.*³³)

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.*³³)

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.*³³)

643

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

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.*³¹)
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.*³¹)
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

664 **DISCUSSION:**

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 TiO_2 nanoparticles, **glaze with CeO_2 nanoparticles** and **photocatalytic**
670 **nanocoatings with TiO_2 nanoparticles** i.e. **Photoeal Masonry[®] & Tipe[®] 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.*⁴⁰. The non emissivity of these test samples is in direct
704 agreement with the simulated insignificant emissions obtained in Shandilya *et al.*⁴¹.

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.*⁴⁰, 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.*⁴¹), 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.*³¹, Shandilya *et al.*³³, Shandilya *et al.*³⁴.**
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 TiO₂ 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.~~ *et 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 TiO₂ from paints containing pigment-TiO₂ or nano-TiO₂ 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 TiO₂ 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.~~ *et 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. Morgeneyer, 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. Morgeneyer, 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., Morgeneyer, 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., Morgeneyer, 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., Morgeneyer, M. Evaluation of the particle
878 aerosolization from n-TiO₂ 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)