

REVIEW ARTICLE

Microfibre Release from Laundering Synthetic Textiles: A Critical Synthesis of Evidence for Applied Textile Design and Manufacturing

Interpreting variability, mitigation technologies, and material choices across ten source records

JAT Editorial Office

academic@curtains.vip

ABSTRACT

Microfibre release from domestic laundering of synthetic textiles is now recognised as a significant pathway for microplastic pollution, yet the evidence base remains heterogeneous in methods, metrics, and reported magnitudes. This editorial review synthesises ten supplied source records spanning 2019-2026, covering washing-machine effluent quantification, mitigation technologies, fibre and fabric parameters, finishing treatments, sewing threads, and recycled versus virgin materials. Reported releases range from gravimetric values such as 162.49 $\pm$ 44.21 mg/kg for acrylic fabrics washed with detergent [2] to fibre-count metrics such as 12,430 fibres g⁻¹ for recycled polyester [7], illustrating that metric choice strongly shapes apparent severity. Mitigation evidence is similarly variable: the Lint LUV-R filter captured an average of 87% of microfibrils by count, compared with 26% for the Cora Ball [1], while recycled low-density polyethylene cartridge filters achieved 52-86% retention in the first cycle and up to 83-99% by the twentieth [3]. Material and construction variables-fibre type, yarn twist, sewing thread Tex, and finishing treatments-emerge as influential but inconsistently quantified [5][6][7]. Nanoparticle-based surface treatments reduced shedding by approximately 46-70% for ZnO and MgO systems, but only ~23% for TiO₂ [9]. Across sources, within-group variability is high, statistical significance is often absent for material comparisons [7], and methodological differences limit direct comparison. For applied textile design and manufacturing, the evidence supports prioritising fibre selection, yarn and thread engineering, and validated filtration, while treating recycled-content claims as performance questions rather than automatic sustainability gains [7]. No single intervention is sufficient; coordinated material, construction, and end-of-pipe strategies are indicated, with uncertainty remaining about long-term durability, real-world laundering behaviour, and regional contexts [10].

Keywords: microfibrils; synthetic textiles; laundering; microplastic pollution; textile manufacturing; filtration; fibre shedding; recycled polyester

SECTION 01

Evidence landscape and measurement heterogeneity

The supplied records converge on a shared premise: domestic laundering of synthetic textiles releases microfibrils that enter wastewater and, ultimately, aquatic environments [1][2][4][5][7]. However, they diverge sharply in how release is measured and reported. McIlwraith et al. quantified microfibrils in laundry effluent by adapting existing methods to measure length, count, and weight, and used this to test two marketed technologies [1]. Mahbub and Shams used gravimetric analysis of filtered washing and drying effluents to determine net weight of released microfibrils from acrylic fabrics, reporting mean length and diameter of approximately 2411 $\pm$ 1500 μ m and 18 $\pm$ 4 μ m respectively [2]. Belzagui et al. assessed retention efficiency of filter arrangements across washing cycles [3]. Romero-Sarmiento et al. introduced a pyrolysis- and oxidation-based Rock-Eval procedure for relative mass quantification, distinguishing natural from chemical fibres via the Tpeak parameter [4]. Gundogdu et al. applied two internationally recognised laundering methods-ISO 105-C06 for fibre

number and length, and ISO 6330 for total fibre number and mass loss-to 51 garments [7]. Zhang et al. combined ICP-AES quantification with FTIR qualitative characterisation, converting measured carbon to PET mass [8]. This methodological plurality is not merely technical detail: it means that a gravimetric value such as 162.49 +/- 44.21 mg/kg [2] and a count-based value such as 12,430 fibres g⁻¹ [7] are not directly comparable, and any synthesis must resist the temptation to rank materials or interventions on incompatible metrics.

A further layer of heterogeneity concerns the textile itself. Studies examine fleece blankets [1], acrylic fabrics [2], polyester, polyamide, cotton, and viscose [4][7], infant PET outerwear [8], and polyester fabrics treated with functionalised nanoparticles [9]. Some focus on fabrics as such, while Rathinamoorthy and Raja Balasaraswathi explicitly address sewing threads as an inevitable part of finished garments [5]. Meerththiga et al. focus on physical and chemical finishing treatments on knitted fabrics [6]. Ashirwadane et al. situate their work in the Sri Lankan retail market, noting mixed hand-washing and machine-washing habits and a growing market of affordable synthetic garment imports [10]. The result is a literature that is rich in mechanisms but uneven in coverage: certain fibre types, fabric architectures, and regional laundering practices remain under-represented, and the supplied records do not permit a systematic meta-analysis. The appropriate editorial stance is therefore a critical synthesis that foregrounds what is robust, what is contested, and what remains uncertain.

SECTION 02

Washing parameters, mechanical stress, and the limits of generalisation

Several records identify washing parameters as material determinants of microfibre release. Mahbub and Shams report that release increased by 2 and 1.4 times respectively when washing and drying time increased from 30 min to 60 min, attributing this to high mechanical stresses and longer rotational forces on fabrics [2]. The same study found that detergent use promoted more microfibre release (162.49 +/- 44.21 mg/kg) than washing without detergent (60.22 +/- 13.32 mg/kg), and that microfibres were released approximately 1.8 times higher at 40 degrees C than at 20 degrees C [2]. Zhang et al. similarly observed that PET microfibre release from infant outerwear increased from 1.75 to 2.53 mg with rising temperature across a 20-40 degrees C range, averaging 2.18 mg [8]. These findings are directionally consistent: greater mechanical action, longer duration, and higher temperature tend to increase shedding. Yet the magnitudes are study-specific, and the mechanisms are not fully decomposed. Detergent effects, for example, may reflect surfactant interaction with fibre surfaces, changes in fibre swelling, or altered mechanical friction, but the supplied records do not isolate these pathways.

A particularly important counterpoint appears in the same acrylic study: subsequent washing and drying cycles showed decreasing patterns of microfibre release, with 45% and 67% less release during the 7th washing and drying cycle respectively compared to the 1st cycle [2]. This suggests that shedding is not a constant property of a garment but a dynamic process that may decline as loosely bound fibres are removed. Belzagui et al. also report that filter retention efficiency changed across washing cycles, with some arrangements starting above 50% and climbing to greater than 80% by the 20th cycle [3]. Taken together, these observations caution against single-cycle characterisation as a proxy for lifetime release. For applied textile design and manufacturing, the implication is that performance claims should specify the cycle number and laundering conditions under which they were obtained, and that durability testing should capture the trajectory of shedding rather than a single snapshot. The evidence does not yet establish a general model for how shedding evolves across the full garment lifetime, and the supplied records do not include long-term field studies.

SECTION 03

Mitigation technologies: filtration and surface treatment

The most direct mitigation evidence concerns end-of-pipe filtration. McIlwraith et al. tested two marketed technologies and found that both significantly reduced microfibre numbers from fleece blankets in washing effluent, with the Lint LUV-R capturing an average of 87% by count compared with 26% for the Cora Ball; the Lint LUV-R also significantly reduced total weight and average length of fibres in effluent [1]. Belzagui et al. proposed four sustainable filtering systems containing

replaceable cartridges partially filled with recycled low-density polyethylene pellets, tested in a household washing machine [3]. Retention efficiency was estimated between 52% and 86% in the first washing cycle and up to 83% to 99% in the 20th, depending on arrangement; filter F2 achieved greater than 90% by the 20th cycle, filter F3 reached almost 100% by the 15th cycle, and filter F4, using the existing washing machine filter, exceeded 90% at the 20th cycle [3]. The cartridges were reported to last more than 30 washing cycles before replacement [3]. These are encouraging results, but they come from different experimental setups and cannot be treated as a single comparative ranking. The McIlwraith et al. study used fleece blankets and specific marketed devices [1], while Belzagui et al. used custom arrangements and recycled polyethylene pellets [3]. Retention efficiency also depends on the size distribution of emitted fibres, which varies by fabric and washing conditions [2][7].

Surface treatment represents a different intervention logic: reducing shedding at source rather than capturing fibres after release. Alves et al. investigated metal oxide nanoparticles (TiO₂, ZnO, MgO) functionalised with fatty acids (oleic acid and stearic acid) as microfibre-retaining agents on polyester fabrics [9]. ZnO and MgO treated with stearic and oleic acid demonstrated a significant reduction in fibre shedding compared to commercial laundry detergent, approximately 46-70%, whereas fatty acid adsorption onto TiO₂ was less efficient, with reduction in microfibre release of about 23%, possibly due to insufficient hydrophobic interaction [9]. This is a promising but early-stage result: the study reports simulated washing cycles and filtration-based assessment, and the supplied abstract does not provide data on durability of the coating across many cycles, skin contact, or environmental fate of the nanoparticles. The contrast between ZnO/MgO and TiO₂ also illustrates that nanoparticle identity and surface chemistry matter, and that broad claims about 'nanomaterial treatments' would be unjustified. For manufacturing specialists, the practical question is whether such treatments can be applied at scale without compromising fabric hand, breathability, or regulatory compliance-questions not answered by the supplied records.

SECTION 04

Fibre type, yarn and thread construction, and finishing

Material composition is repeatedly identified as a major driver of shedding, but the evidence is nuanced. Gundogdu et al. analysed 51 garments from five global fashion brands, including cotton, virgin and recycled polyester, and virgin and recycled polyamide, using ISO 105-C06 and ISO 6330 [7]. Descriptively, recycled polyester released the highest mean number of microfibres (12,430 fibres g⁻¹), approximately 55% more than virgin polyester (8,028 fibres g⁻¹); however, this difference was not statistically significant across material categories, reflecting high within-group variability [7]. In contrast, fibre length differed significantly by material type, with recycled polyester and recycled polyamide producing significantly shorter fibres (mean 0.42 mm) than cotton and virgin polyester (mean 0.52 mm) [7]. Cotton released a greater total fibre mass (1.85 mg g⁻¹), but these fibres were longer and fewer in number [7]. Statistical analysis indicated that shedding was largely driven by fibre type and material properties rather than brand-specific differences, although some garments-particularly from one brand-consistently exhibited higher fibre release across both virgin and recycled synthetic materials, suggesting that textile design and manufacturing practices may also influence shedding intensity [7]. This is a critical finding for applied textile development: recycled content should not be assumed to be automatically lower-impact with respect to microfibre release, and performance-based evaluation is needed [7].

Construction details beyond fibre type are also implicated. Rathinamoorthy and Raja Balasaraswathi examined sewing threads and reported an average release of 2.65 $\pm$ 0.70 (n=33) microfibres/m from sewing thread sewn on fabric during laundering [5]. The sewing process caused damage to the thread, leading to comparatively higher microfibre release (approximately 114%) compared with threads washed before sewing [5]. Among selected threads, higher emissions were reported with spun threads, followed by twistless filaments, and twisted filament threads; coarser threads with higher Tex values released more microfibres than finer Tex threads, with an 80Tex spun thread showing a 22-150% increase compared with a 20Tex spun thread [5]. In filament threads, twist was found to be efficient in reducing emission: ply twisted filaments exhibited approximately 76% lower microfibre emissions than untwisted filaments [5]. The study concluded that sewing thread contributed approximately 1.09% of total microfibre emissions from apparel during laundry [5]. That percentage is modest, but it identifies a design lever-thread selection and twist-that is directly actionable in garment engineering and is often overlooked in fabric-centric studies. Meerththiga et al. address physical and chemical finishing treatments on knitted fabrics,

framing finishing as a factor influencing microplastic fibre release during laundering [6]. The supplied abstract does not report specific effect sizes, so the direction and magnitude of finishing effects cannot be quantified here; it nonetheless signals that finishing is part of the causal chain and warrants controlled investigation.

SECTION 05

Analytical advances and their implications for claims

Progress in analytical chemistry is reshaping what can be claimed about microfibre release. Romero-Sarmiento et al. developed a Rock-Eval-based procedure for relative mass quantification of textile microfibrils emitted from washing machines, defining specific linear regressions for natural and chemical fibres and verifying that results are not affected by polymer shape (fibre versus pellet) or fibre nature (cotton versus polyester) [4]. They also confirmed that the Tpeak parameter can distinguish natural (cotton, linen) from chemical (polyester PET, nylon PA, viscose) fibres, and applied the method to real laundry wastewaters pre-filtered on a silica membrane [4]. This matters because many mitigation and material claims depend on distinguishing synthetic from natural fibres, and on quantifying mass rather than count alone. Zhang et al. developed a combined ICP-AES and FTIR workflow for infant PET outerwear, converting carbon measured by ICP-AES to PET mass while FTIR confirmed polymer identity via peaks at 1713, 1251, and 1090 cm⁻¹ [8]. They explicitly contrast this with SP-ICP-MS, which they describe as less effective for larger, irregular textile fibres [8]. These methodological developments do not resolve the comparability problem, but they expand the range of questions that can be asked with confidence—particularly regarding fibre origin and mass balance.

For applied textile researchers and product developers, the analytical literature carries a practical warning: a claim about 'microfibre reduction' is only as strong as the metric and method behind it. Count-based reductions may not correspond to mass-based reductions, and vice versa, because fibre length and diameter distributions differ by material and treatment [2][4][7]. Gundogdu et al. found that cotton released greater total fibre mass but fewer, longer fibres, while recycled synthetics released more fibres that were significantly shorter [7]. A filtration device optimised for one fibre size distribution may perform differently against another [1][3]. Similarly, a surface treatment that reduces mass loss may not reduce fibre count if it preferentially retains longer fibres. The supplied records do not include a standardised cross-method validation study, so the field currently lacks a common currency for comparing interventions. This is an uncertainty that should be stated plainly in product documentation and in any environmental claim.

SECTION 06

Implications for applied textile design and manufacturing

Several actionable directions emerge, albeit with caveats. First, fibre and material selection should be treated as a performance decision informed by shedding data, not by sustainability labels alone. The finding that recycled polyester descriptively released more fibres than virgin polyester, even though the difference was not statistically significant, challenges assumptions that rPET is inherently lower-shedding [7]. Manufacturers evaluating recycled content should therefore request shedding data under relevant standardised conditions and should not rely on recycled content as a proxy for reduced microfibre release. Second, yarn and thread engineering offer under-exploited levers. The evidence that ply-twisted filaments released approximately 76% fewer microfibrils than untwisted filaments, and that coarser Tex threads released more than finer ones, points to specific design choices in sewing thread specification [5]. Given that sewing thread contributed approximately 1.09% of total apparel microfibre emissions in that study [5], the absolute benefit is small but real, and it may be compounded across many garments.

Third, finishing and surface treatment require careful, material-specific validation. The nanoparticle study shows that ZnO and MgO functionalised with stearic and oleic acid reduced shedding by approximately 46-70%, while TiO₂-based systems achieved only about 23% [9]. This variability means that 'nanoparticle treatment' is not a single intervention, and that formulation chemistry determines performance. Durability, cost, and regulatory considerations are not addressed in the supplied abstract and would need to be resolved before manufacturing adoption. Fourth, end-of-pipe filtration remains the most directly evidenced mitigation route, with the Lint LUV-R capturing an average of 87% by count [1] and custom

recycled-polyethylene cartridge filters achieving 52-86% in the first cycle and up to 83-99% by the 20th [3]. However, these devices place responsibility on consumers and require behaviour change, maintenance, and cartridge replacement. The reported cartridge life of more than 30 washing cycles [3] is useful for design and consumer communication, but real-world adherence is unknown. Finally, regional context matters: Ashirwadane et al. highlight mixed hand-washing and machine-washing habits and a growing market of affordable synthetic garment imports in Sri Lanka, noting a research gap in developing nations [10]. Mitigation strategies designed for Western machine-washing contexts may not transfer directly, and manufacturing decisions for such markets should be informed by locally relevant laundering data.

CONCLUSION

Conclusions

The supplied records establish that laundering synthetic textiles releases microfibres and that release is influenced by washing parameters, fibre type, yarn and thread construction, finishing, and material origin [1][2][4][5][6][7][8][9][10]. They also show that mitigation is feasible: filtration can capture a large share of emitted fibres [1][3], and surface treatments can reduce shedding at source for specific formulations [9]. However, the evidence base is methodologically heterogeneous, with count-based, mass-based, and hybrid metrics that are not directly comparable [1][2][4][7][8]. Statistical significance is often absent for material comparisons, and within-group variability is high [7]. For applied textile design and manufacturing, the defensible position is to treat microfibre release as a multi-factor performance attribute, to specify the laundering conditions and cycle number for any claim, to prioritise fibre and thread engineering alongside filtration, and to evaluate recycled-content materials on measured shedding rather than assumed benefit [5][7]. No single intervention is sufficient, and no supplied record supports a universal ranking of materials or technologies.

SCOPE

Limitations

This editorial review is based solely on the ten supplied source records and does not claim systematic-review methods. The records span different fibre types, fabric architectures, washing machines, laundering conditions, and analytical metrics, which limits direct comparison and precludes meta-analysis. Several sources are conference proceedings or short abstracts [6][10], and effect sizes for finishing treatments are not reported in the supplied abstract [6]. Some findings rest on single studies without independent replication, including the nanoparticle treatment results [9] and the sewing thread contribution estimate [5]. Statistical significance is reported as absent for key material comparisons in one large garment study [7], and within-group variability is high. Long-term shedding trajectories, real-world consumer behaviour, regional laundering practices, and the durability and environmental fate of surface treatments are not adequately covered by the supplied records. No DOI strings, author affiliations, or external references have been introduced, and all factual literature claims are cited to the supplied source IDs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

References

1. Hayley K McIlwraith, Jack Lin, L. Erdle, N. Mallos, et al.. (2019). Capturing microfibers - marketed technologies reduce microfiber emissions from washing machines.. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*.
2. M. Mahbub, Mehnaz Shams. (2022). Acrylic fabrics as a source of microplastics from portable washer and dryer: Impact of washing and drying parameters.. *Science of the Total Environment*.
3. Francisco Belzagui, C. Gutierrez-Bouzan, F. Carrillo-Navarrete, V. Lopez-Grimau. (2023). Sustainable Filtering Systems to Reduce Microfiber Emissions from Textiles during Household Laundering. *Polymers*.
4. M. Romero-Sarmiento, S. Rohais, M. Dreillard. (2024). Quantification of textile microfibers from laundry wastewater using the Rock-Eval device: Difference between natural and synthetic microfiber origin.. *Science of the Total Environment*.

5. R. Rathinamoorthy, S. Raja Balasaraswathi. (2024). Assessing the Contribution of Sewing Threads to Microfiber Release During Domestic Laundering.. *Environmental Pollution*.
6. G. Meerththiga, R.E. Jastina, V. Vajeevan, U. Gunasekara, et al.. (2025). Analyzing the influence of physical and chemical finishing treatments on microplastic emission from knitted fabrics during laundering. *Proceeding of Textile Engineering Research Symposium -TERS2025*.
7. Sedat Gundogdu, I. Ozkan, Urska Trunk, Nusa Urbancic. (2026). Comparative microfiber shedding from natural, virgin and recycled synthetic textiles under standardised laundering conditions. *Environmental Research Communications*.
8. Qiang Zhang, Haidong Xu, Dong-Ming Zheng, Hao-Nan Cheng, et al.. (2026). Qualitative and Quantitative Characterization of Microplastics Released from Infant PET Outerwear Using ICP-AES and FTIR. *Molecules*.
9. Andreia A. S. Alves, D. Carvalho, Elodie Melro, Marco Sebastiao, et al.. (2026). Functionalized Metal Oxide Nanoparticles to Reduce Polyester Microfiber Release During Laundry Washing. *Textiles*.
10. B. A. S. Ashirwadane, A. S. M. Thennakoon, P. D. Munasinghe. (2025). Quantification of microfiber shedding from synthetic garments: a case study of the Sri Lankan retail market. *Proceedings of the ERU Symposium 2025*.