

REVIEW ARTICLE

Microfibre Release from Laundering Synthetic Textiles: A Critical Synthesis of Mechanisms, Mitigation Technologies and Material Design

Evidence from controlled laundering studies, filtration trials and fibre-level analyses

JAT Editorial Office

academic@curtains.vip

ABSTRACT

Microfibre release during domestic laundering of synthetic textiles is now recognised as a significant pathway for microplastic pollution, yet the evidence base remains fragmented across fibre types, test methods and mitigation technologies. This editorial review synthesises ten supplied source records to examine what is known about release mechanisms, the performance of capture and treatment technologies, and the implications for applied textile design and manufacturing. Controlled studies show that release is strongly modulated by washing parameters: longer wash and dry times, higher temperature and detergent use all increase shedding from acrylic fabrics, while release declines across repeated cycles [2]. Fibre type and construction matter: recycled polyester has been reported to shed more fibres by count than virgin polyester, though with high within-group variability and no statistically significant difference across material categories [7], while sewing thread contributes a small but non-trivial share of total apparel emissions and is sensitive to thread structure and Tex value [5]. Mitigation evidence spans washing-machine filters, which achieved 26-87% capture by count in one trial [1] and 52-99% retention depending on filter arrangement in another [3], through to nanoparticle surface treatments reducing polyester shedding by approximately 23-70% [9]. Analytical advances, including Rock-Eval pyrolysis-oxidation and combined ICP-AES/FTIR workflows, are improving the distinction between natural and synthetic fibres and the quantification of mass-based release [4][8]. Across the evidence, methodological heterogeneity, small sample sizes and limited standardisation constrain comparison and generalisation. For textile designers and manufacturers, the emerging picture favours integrated strategies: fibre and yarn selection, thread engineering, finishing treatments and washing-machine interventions, supported by performance-based evaluation rather than material labels alone.

Keywords: microfibres; synthetic textiles; laundering; microplastic pollution; textile finishing; filtration; fibre shedding; sustainable manufacturing

SECTION 01

Introduction: framing the laundering-microfibre problem

Synthetic textiles are a dominant material class in global apparel, and their laundering has become one of the most studied pathways for microplastic entry into aquatic environments. Manmade fibres such as polyester, acrylic and nylon are reported to represent around 60% of worldwide textile fibre consumption [2], and domestic laundering can release thousands of fibres into washing-machine effluent with every wash [1]. The environmental concern is not only the volume of material released but its continuous and cumulative character: microfibres are described as high-concern pollutants because they enter the environment steadily through routine household activity rather than through discrete industrial incidents [3]. This framing has shifted attention from end-of-pipe wastewater treatment towards the washing machine, the garment and the fibre itself as intervention points.

The supplied evidence base reflects this shift but is uneven. Some studies focus on quantifying release under controlled washing and drying parameters [2], others on the performance of capture technologies [1][3], and others on the material and construction variables that determine how much a garment sheds [5][7]. A further group addresses analytical methods for identifying and quantifying microfibre release in laundry wastewater, including the distinction between natural and synthetic origins [4] and the characterisation of PET microfibre release from infant outerwear [8]. Recent work has begun to examine finishing treatments [6] and nanoparticle-based surface modification [9] as design-side mitigation routes. Taken together, these sources do not constitute a systematic review, and the present synthesis does not claim systematic-review methods; it is a critical editorial reading of the available records, with explicit attention to disagreements, uncertainty and practical implications.

A recurring difficulty is that 'microfibre release' is measured in different ways across studies: by count, by mass, by length distribution, or by a combination of these. One trial measured length, count and weight of microfibre release in laundry effluent [1]; another used gravimetric analysis to determine net weight of released microfibre release [2]; a third used filtration and weighing of retained fibres [9]; and a fourth applied pyrolysis-oxidation parameters to estimate relative mass concentrations of natural and synthetic fibres [4]. These methodological choices are not interchangeable, and they help explain why headline reduction percentages cannot be compared directly across the literature.

SECTION 02

Mechanisms and washing parameters: what controlled studies show

The strongest mechanistic evidence in the supplied sources comes from controlled washing and drying experiments on acrylic fabrics using a portable washer and dryer [2]. In that study, increasing washing and drying time from 30 to 60 minutes increased microfibre release by factors of 2 and 1.4 respectively, attributed to higher mechanical stresses and longer rotational forces acting on the fabric [2]. Detergent use also promoted release: washing with detergent produced 162.49 +/- 44.21 mg/kg of microfibre release compared with 60.22 +/- 13.32 mg/kg without detergent [2]. Water temperature mattered as well, with release approximately 1.8 times higher at 40 degrees C than at 20 degrees C [2]. These findings align with a broader physical picture in which mechanical agitation, chemistry and thermal energy combine to abrade and weaken fibres.

A notable and sometimes counter-intuitive finding is that release declined across repeated washing and drying cycles. The same acrylic study reported 45% less release during the seventh washing cycle and 67% less during the seventh drying cycle compared with the first cycle [2]. This suggests that a substantial fraction of loosely bound fibre material is removed early in a garment's life, after which shedding rates fall. If replicated across fibre types, this has practical implications for how shedding is measured and reported: a single first-wash measurement may overstate lifetime release, while a short wash test may understate the cumulative contribution of many low-shedding cycles. The evidence here is limited to one fibre type and one machine configuration, so the generality of the decline pattern remains uncertain.

Temperature effects are also reported in a different context. In a study of PET microfibre release from infant outerwear, release increased from 1.75 to 2.53 mg as washing temperature rose across a 20-40 degrees C range, averaging 2.18 mg [8]. The absolute quantities and the measurement approach differ from the acrylic study, but the direction of the temperature effect is consistent. What remains unresolved is the relative importance of temperature versus mechanical action versus detergent chemistry across realistic domestic wash programmes, and whether the observed effects are additive, synergistic or saturating. The supplied sources do not provide a factorial design that would allow these factors to be separated cleanly.

SECTION 03

Material, yarn and construction variables

Fibre type and material properties emerge as major determinants of shedding. In a standardised comparison of 51 garments from five global fashion brands, recycled polyester (rPET) released the highest mean number of microfibre release at 12,430 fibres g⁻¹, approximately 55% more than virgin polyester at 8,028 fibres g⁻¹, although this difference was not statistically significant across material categories because of high within-group variability [7]. Fibre length, by contrast, differed significantly by material type: rPET and recycled polyamide produced 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]. This dissociation between count-based and mass-based metrics is central to interpreting the literature: a material can appear worse or better depending on which metric is used.

The same study found that shedding was largely driven by fibre type and material properties rather than brand-specific differences, yet some garments, particularly from one brand, consistently exhibited higher fibre release across both virgin and recycled synthetic materials [7]. This suggests that textile design and manufacturing practices, including yarn spinning, fabric construction and finishing, can influence shedding intensity independently of the nominal fibre type. The finding also challenges the assumption that rPET is automatically a lower-impact alternative; the authors explicitly call for performance-based evaluation of textile materials rather than reliance on material labels [7]. Given the high within-group variability and the descriptive nature of the count comparison, this should be treated as a strong signal for further investigation rather than a settled conclusion.

Construction details below the fabric level also matter. Sewing thread, an inevitable component of finished garments, released an average of 2.65 $\pm$ 0.70 microfibrils per metre (n=33) during laundering, and the sewing process itself damaged thread, leading to approximately 114% higher release compared with threads washed before sewing [5]. Thread structure influenced emissions: spun threads released more than twistless filaments, which in turn released more than twisted filament threads [5]. Coarser threads with higher Tex values released more microfibrils; compared with a 20 Tex spun thread, an 80 Tex spun thread showed a 22-150% increase in release [5]. In filament threads, ply twisting was associated with approximately 76% lower emissions than untwisted filaments [5]. Overall, sewing thread was estimated to contribute approximately 1.09% of total microfibre emissions from apparel during laundry [5]. This is a small share, but it is a design-controllable one, and it illustrates how component-level choices can alter whole-garment shedding.

SECTION 04

Capture and treatment technologies: filters, additives and surface modification

Washing-machine interventions have been tested with encouraging but variable results. In one trial, two marketed technologies were assessed: the Lint LUV-R filter captured an average of 87% of microfibrils by count, while the Cora Ball captured 26% by count; the Lint LUV-R also significantly reduced total weight and average fibre length in effluent [1]. The authors note that further research is needed to understand other sources of microfibre emissions, but conclude that available technologies could be adopted to reduce emissions from laundering textiles [1]. The wide gap between the two devices indicates that capture mechanism and placement matter greatly, and that a single reduction figure cannot represent 'filtration' as a category.

A separate study proposed four sustainable filtering systems using replaceable cartridges partially filled with recycled low-density polyethylene pellets, tested in a household washing machine over multiple cycles [3]. Retention efficiency was estimated between 52% and 86% in the first washing cycle and up to 83-99% by the twentieth cycle, depending on arrangement [3]. Filter F1 (4 cm diameter, 30 cm height) retained more than 50% of microfibrils initially, rising to 66% at the tenth cycle and greater than 80% at the twentieth [3]. Filter F2 (6.3 cm diameter, 41 cm height) achieved greater than 90% retention by the twentieth cycle, while filter F3, with reversed flow, reached almost 100% retention by the fifteenth cycle, and filter F4, using the existing washing-machine filter, exceeded 90% at the twentieth cycle [3]. Cartridges were reported to last more than 30 washing cycles before replacement [3]. These results suggest that retention can improve with use, possibly as the cartridge bed matures, but the study is limited to one machine type and a defined set of arrangements.

Chemical and surface treatments represent a different mitigation route. Functionalised metal oxide nanoparticles (TiO₂, ZnO, MgO) modified with fatty acids (oleic acid and stearic acid) were applied to polyester fabrics and evaluated in simulated washing cycles [9]. ZnO and MgO treated with stearic and oleic acid demonstrated a significant reduction in fibre shedding compared with commercial laundry detergent, approximately 46-70%, whereas fatty acid adsorption onto TiO₂ was less efficient, with a reduction of about 23%, and TiO₂-based systems showed limited improvement, possibly due to insufficient hydrophobic interaction [9]. The authors describe fatty acid functionalisation of low-cost inorganic nanoparticles as a

promising strategy for mitigating microfibre pollution in laundry effluents [9]. This is early-stage evidence, and questions of durability, laundering persistence, ecotoxicology and manufacturing scalability are not resolved by the supplied record.

Finishing treatments more broadly are identified as an important but under-examined variable. One study explicitly focuses on how different textile finishing treatments influence microplastic fibre release during laundering, framing the work around the need to understand release mechanisms and textile parameters in order to develop effective mitigation strategies [6]. Because the supplied abstract does not report quantitative outcomes, the direction and magnitude of finishing effects cannot be assessed here; it is included as evidence of an active research gap rather than as a result.

SECTION 05

Measurement and analytical advances

Progress in mitigation depends on reliable measurement, and the supplied sources document several methodological developments. A pyrolysis- and oxidation-based method using the Rock-Eval device was applied to natural (cotton, linen) and synthetic (polyester PET, nylon PA, viscose) textiles to develop a procedure for relative mass quantification of textile microfibrils emitted from washing machines [4]. Specific linear regressions of Rock-Eval parameters were defined for each investigated fibre, and results were reported to be unaffected by polymer shape (fibre versus pellet) and by fibre nature (cotton versus polyester) [4]. The Tpeak parameter was identified as useful for distinguishing natural from chemical fibres, and the method was successfully applied to evaluate relative mass concentrations of natural and synthetic fibres in real laundry wastewaters pre-filtered on a silica membrane [4]. This is significant because it addresses a persistent problem: distinguishing natural from synthetic microfibrils in complex effluent, which count-based methods alone cannot do.

A complementary approach combined ICP-AES quantification with FTIR qualitative characterisation for PET microfibrils from infant outerwear [8]. Washing was simulated using a colour fastness tester at 20-40 degrees C, with samples pretreated by Fenton oxidation and NaBr density separation; carbon measured by ICP-AES was converted to PET mass, while FTIR confirmed polymer identity through peaks at 1713, 1251 and 1090 cm⁻¹ [8]. The authors position this against SP-ICP-MS, which they describe as less effective for larger, irregular textile fibres, and present the combined workflow as a way to realise qualitative and quantitative analysis of microplastics to some extent [8]. The method's relevance to infant apparel reflects concern about early-life exposure and the vulnerability of infant physiological systems [8].

These analytical advances do not by themselves resolve comparability problems. Rock-Eval provides relative mass quantification calibrated per fibre type [4]; ICP-AES/FTIR provides mass and identity for PET in a specific product category [8]; count-based methods provide number and length distributions [1][7]. Each answers a different question. A practical implication is that claims about 'reducing microfibre release' should specify the metric, the fibre type and the test conditions, because a treatment or material that reduces fibre count may not reduce total mass, and vice versa, as the cotton versus polyester comparison illustrates [7].

SECTION 06

Geographical and contextual gaps

The evidence base is geographically concentrated, and at least one supplied source explicitly identifies a research gap in developing nations. A Sri Lankan retail-market study notes that while the issue is well documented globally, there is a substantial gap in developing nations, and that Sri Lanka presents a unique case due to mixed laundering habits (hand washing versus washing machines) and a growing market of affordable synthetic garment imports, differing from the Western contexts where most data originate [10]. The stated aim is to provide a quantitative analysis of microfibre pollution from Sri Lankan fashion retailers and to establish a baseline for future mitigation strategies [10].

This contextual point matters for applied textile design and manufacturing. Washing-machine filters and machine-based interventions presume access to and use of domestic washing machines, whereas hand washing may produce different mechanical and chemical conditions and different shedding profiles. The supplied sources do not quantify hand-washing release, so the relative contribution of hand washing remains uncertain. Similarly, the infant outerwear study [8] and the Sri

Lankan retail study [10] indicate that product category and market context shape both exposure and intervention feasibility. Generalising from laboratory or high-income-market conditions to global supply chains should therefore be done cautiously.

CONCLUSION

Conclusions

The supplied evidence supports several cautious conclusions. First, microfibre release during laundering is real, measurable and influenced by controllable washing parameters: longer wash and dry times, higher temperature and detergent use increase shedding from acrylic fabrics, while release declines across repeated cycles [2], and a similar temperature direction is observed for PET infant outerwear [8]. Second, material and construction choices matter. Recycled polyester has been reported to shed more fibres by count than virgin polyester, though not statistically significantly given high variability, while producing significantly shorter fibres [7]; sewing thread contributes a small but design-controllable share of total apparel emissions, with thread structure and Tex value influencing release [5]. Third, mitigation is technically feasible but performance varies widely: washing-machine filters captured 26-87% by count in one trial [1] and achieved 52-99% retention depending on arrangement in another [3], while fatty-acid-functionalised ZnO and MgO nanoparticles reduced polyester shedding by approximately 46-70% in simulated washing [9]. Fourth, measurement is advancing through Rock-Eval pyrolysis-oxidation for natural versus synthetic discrimination [4] and combined ICP-AES/FTIR for PET quantification [8], but metric heterogeneity limits direct comparison. For applied textile design and manufacturing, the implication is not a single silver-bullet intervention but an integrated approach: specify fibre and yarn parameters with shedding in mind, engineer thread and fabric construction, evaluate finishing treatments for their effect on release [6], and treat material labels such as 'recycled' as hypotheses to be tested rather than guarantees of lower shedding [7]. Performance-based evaluation, reported with explicit metrics and test conditions, is the most defensible basis for design decisions.

SCOPE

Limitations

This editorial review is based solely on the ten supplied source records and does not claim systematic-review methods; no comprehensive search, screening or quality appraisal was performed. Several sources are conference proceedings or symposium abstracts with limited methodological detail [6][10], and one reports no quantitative outcomes in the supplied abstract [6], so its findings cannot be assessed. Sample sizes and replication vary: the sewing-thread study reports $n=33$ measurements [5], the garment comparison covers 51 garments from five brands [7], and the acrylic study uses a portable washer and dryer that may not represent domestic machines [2]. Measurement metrics differ across studies (count, mass, length, relative mass), which limits direct comparison of reduction percentages [1][2][4][7][9]. Some findings, notably the higher count-based shedding of recycled polyester, were not statistically significant because of high within-group variability [7], and the decline in release across repeated cycles is demonstrated for one fibre type and machine configuration [2]. Filter performance was tested in specific machine and arrangement configurations [1][3], and nanoparticle treatments were evaluated in simulated washing with unresolved questions of durability, persistence and ecotoxicology [9]. Geographical coverage is skewed towards high-income-market washing-machine contexts, with an explicit gap identified for developing nations and hand-washing practices [10]. No source in the supplied set provides a full life-cycle assessment, and no source establishes causal links

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. Meerthiga, 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*.