

REVIEW ARTICLE

Microfibre Release from Laundering Synthetic Textiles: A Critical Synthesis of Mechanisms, Measurement and Mitigation

Evidence from controlled laundering studies, filtration technologies and fibre-engineering interventions

JAT Editorial Office

academic@curtains.vip

ABSTRACT

Microfibre release during domestic laundering is now recognised as a major pathway for microplastic pollution, yet the evidence base remains fragmented across measurement methods, fibre types and intervention strategies. This editorial review synthesises ten supplied studies to examine what is reliably known, where findings diverge, and what the disagreements imply for applied textile design and manufacturing. Consistent evidence indicates that mechanical and thermal laundering parameters strongly modulate release: longer wash and dry cycles increase shedding [2], higher wash temperature raises PET microfiber mass [8], and detergent use promotes release relative to water alone [2]. However, release is not monotonic; subsequent cycles show declining emissions [2], and filtration performance improves over successive washes [3]. Material comparisons reveal contested ground: recycled polyester has been reported to shed more fibres than virgin polyester descriptively, though the difference was not statistically significant amid high variability [7]. Fibre length, yarn structure and garment construction also matter, with sewing threads contributing a small but non-trivial share of total emissions [5]. Mitigation evidence spans end-of-pipe filtration, with retention efficiencies ranging from 26% to over 90% depending on device and cycle [1][3], and fibre-surface engineering, where fatty-acid-functionalised metal oxide nanoparticles reduced shedding by approximately 46-70% in one study [9]. Measurement innovation, including Rock-Eval pyrolysis and ICP-AES/FTIR workflows, is improving the ability to distinguish natural from synthetic fibres and to quantify mass rather than count alone [4][8]. The synthesis cautions against single-metric claims, highlights the dominance of polyester and acrylic in the literature, and identifies standardisation, real-world laundering behaviour and design-for-reduced-shedding as priority areas for applied textile research and manufacturing.

Keywords: microfibres; synthetic textiles; laundering; microplastic pollution; filtration; fibre shedding; textile finishing; recycled polyester

SECTION 01

Introduction: the laundering-microfibre nexus and the scope of this review

Synthetic textiles are a dominant material class in global apparel, with manmade fibres such as polyester, acrylic and nylon representing a substantial share of worldwide fibre consumption [2]. During domestic laundering, these textiles abrade and shed microfibrils, defined as fibrous debris with a length below 5 mm, which are increasingly treated as a high-concern subset of microplastics because of their continuous and cumulative entry into aquatic environments [3]. The supplied literature converges on laundering as a critical emission pathway, but it does so from different methodological starting points: some studies quantify effluent load from specific fabrics under controlled conditions [2], others test marketed or prototype capture technologies [1][3], and a further group examines how fibre type, yarn structure or finishing treatments alter shedding [5][6][7][9]. This diversity is a strength for triangulation but a challenge for comparability, because fibre count, fibre mass, fibre length and polymer identity are not interchangeable metrics.

This review does not claim systematic-review methods. It is an editorial synthesis of ten supplied source records, selected to represent the main evidentiary strands: laundering-parameter effects, material comparisons, filtration interventions, surface treatments, construction-level contributions and analytical method development. The aim is to distinguish what is well supported, what is contested, and what remains uncertain, and to translate those distinctions into implications for applied textile design and manufacturing without endorsing any commercial product. Where studies disagree, the disagreement is treated as informative rather than as noise to be averaged away.

A recurring theme is that microfibre release is not a single material property but an outcome of interacting variables: fibre chemistry, yarn and fabric structure, garment construction, finishing, washing machine mechanics, water temperature, detergent chemistry and cycle duration [2][5][6][7][8]. This interactionist framing matters for manufacturing because it implies that interventions at different stages of the value chain may have non-additive effects. A filter that captures 87% of fibres by count [1] and a surface treatment that reduces shedding by 46-70% [9] operate on different parts of the same system, and their combined performance cannot be inferred from either result alone.

SECTION 02

Laundering parameters as dominant, but non-monotonic, drivers of release

The strongest and most consistent evidence in the supplied set concerns laundering parameters. In a study of acrylic fabrics washed and dried in a portable machine, increasing wash and dry time from 30 to 60 minutes raised microfibre release by factors of 2 and 1.4 respectively, attributed to greater mechanical stress and longer rotational forces on the fabric [2]. The same study found that detergent use promoted release, with 162.49 +/- 44.21 mg/kg released with detergent versus 60.22 +/- 13.32 mg/kg without, and that washing at 40 degrees C released approximately 1.8 times more than at 20 degrees C [2]. These findings align with a separate study of infant PET outerwear, where microfiber release increased from 1.75 to 2.53 mg as temperature rose across a 20-40 degrees C simulated laundering range, averaging 2.18 mg [8]. Together, these results support a practical inference: mechanical energy, thermal energy and surfactant chemistry each contribute to shedding, and reducing any of them tends to reduce release.

However, the relationship is not monotonic over the garment lifetime. The acrylic study reported that microfibre release declined by 45% during the 7th washing cycle and by 67% during the 7th drying cycle compared with the first cycle [2]. This suggests that a substantial fraction of readily detachable fibre is removed early in a garment's life, after which shedding rates fall. This has two implications. First, first-wash emissions may be disproportionately important for environmental load, which argues for pre-treatment or pre-washing strategies at the manufacturing or retail stage. Second, single-cycle laboratory measurements may overstate long-run emissions if they are extrapolated without accounting for decay. The decline is not necessarily universal across fibre types or fabric constructions, and the supplied evidence does not establish a general decay curve, so this remains an interpretation with moderate confidence rather than a settled parameter.

The parameter evidence also exposes a measurement tension. The acrylic study used gravimetric analysis of filtered effluent to determine net weight [2], whereas the infant PET study converted ICP-AES carbon measurements to PET mass and confirmed polymer identity by FTIR [8]. Both report mass, but they differ in pretreatment, separation and conversion assumptions. The convergence of their directional findings on temperature is therefore reassuring, but the absolute values should not be treated as directly comparable. For manufacturing specialists, the actionable point is that temperature and cycle-time reductions are low-regret interventions, while the magnitude of benefit depends on the baseline wash profile and the fibre blend.

SECTION 03

Material and construction effects: contested comparisons and under-examined contributors

Material comparisons are the most contested area in the supplied evidence. A standardised study of 51 commercially available garments from five global fashion brands compared cotton, virgin polyester, recycled polyester, virgin polyamide and recycled polyamide using ISO 105-C06 and ISO 6330 methods [7]. Descriptively, recycled polyester released the highest mean number of microfibrils (12,430 fibres g⁻¹), approximately 55% more than virgin polyester (8,028 fibres g⁻¹), but this difference was not statistically significant across material categories because of high within-group variability [7]. By 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].

This pattern is important for two reasons. First, it shows that count, length and mass can rank materials differently. A material that releases many short fibres may pose different environmental and analytical challenges than one that releases fewer long fibres, and a mass-only metric would obscure the difference. Second, the non-significant count difference does not license the claim that recycled and virgin polyester are equivalent; it indicates that the study was underpowered to detect a difference of that size given the variability, and that brand-level and garment-level factors may dominate. Indeed, the same study noted that 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 influence shedding intensity [7]. This is a crucial caveat for sustainability claims: recycled content is not a reliable proxy for lower shedding.

Construction-level evidence is thinner but points to a neglected contributor. A study of sewing threads found an average release of 2.65 $\pm$ 0.70 microfibrils per metre of thread sewn on fabric during laundering, with the sewing process itself damaging thread and leading to approximately 114% higher release compared with threads washed before sewing [5]. Among thread types, spun threads released more than twistless filaments, and twisted filament threads released least; coarser threads with higher Tex values released more, with an 80 Tex spun thread showing a 22-150% increase over a 20 Tex spun thread [5]. Ply-twisted filaments exhibited approximately 76% lower emissions than untwisted filaments [5]. Overall, sewing thread contributed approximately 1.09% of total microfibre emissions from apparel during laundry [5]. The small percentage should not be dismissed: it identifies a specific, design-controllable component whose emissions can be reduced through thread selection and twist optimisation.

Finishing treatments are another under-examined lever. One supplied study explicitly focuses on how physical and chemical finishing treatments influence microplastic fibre release from knitted fabrics during laundering, framing the work around the need to understand mechanisms and textile parameters to develop mitigation strategies [6]. The abstract does not report quantitative outcomes, so its contribution here is to establish finishing as a recognised variable rather than to supply effect sizes. This is a limitation of the evidence base: the category of finishing is acknowledged as important, but the supplied records do not yet provide the comparative data needed to rank treatments.

SECTION 04

End-of-pipe filtration: variable performance, improving over cycles, and the metric problem

Filtration technologies are the most directly quantified mitigation option in the supplied set, but their reported performance varies widely and depends on device design, measurement metric and cycle number. An early study tested two marketed technologies, the Cora Ball and the Lint LUV-R filter, on fleece blankets and found that both significantly reduced microfibre numbers in washing effluent, with the Lint LUV-R capturing an average of 87% by count compared with 26% for the Cora Ball [1]. The Lint LUV-R also significantly reduced total weight and average length of fibres in effluent [1]. The large gap between 87% and 26% by count illustrates that not all capture technologies are equivalent, and that in-machine or in-drum devices may perform differently from external filters.

A later 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 depended on arrangement and cycle number: filter F1 (4 cm diameter, 30 cm height) retained more than 50% at the 10th cycle, 66% at the 20th, and greater than 80% by the 20th cycle in the reported sequence; F2 (6.3 cm diameter, 41 cm height) achieved greater

than 90% at the 20th cycle; F3, with reversed flow, reached almost 100% at the 15th cycle; and F4, using the existing washing machine filter, exceeded 90% at the 20th cycle [3]. Across arrangements, retention was estimated between 52% and 86% in the first cycle and up to 83-99% by the 20th, with cartridges lasting more than 30 washing cycles [3].

The apparent improvement in retention over successive cycles is a striking finding that deserves careful interpretation. It may reflect filter conditioning, progressive capture of a fibre population that becomes less abundant over cycles, or both. The acrylic study's observation that shedding declines in later cycles [2] is consistent with the second explanation, meaning that some of the apparent gain in retention efficiency could be a denominator effect rather than an improvement in capture. The supplied studies do not resolve this, so the practical implication is that filtration performance claims should specify the cycle number and the reference shedding rate. For manufacturers and product developers, the more robust conclusion is that well-designed filtration can capture a large majority of fibres by count, but that reported efficiencies are not directly comparable across studies because of differences in fabric, wash programme, effluent sampling and metric.

A further limitation is that filtration addresses emissions at the point of use, not the generation of microfibre. It does not reduce the mechanical degradation of the textile itself, and it places maintenance burdens on consumers, including cartridge replacement and disposal [3]. From a manufacturing perspective, filtration is therefore a complementary rather than substitutive strategy: it can reduce environmental load from existing garments, but it does not change the design properties that determine how much fibre is generated in the first place.

SECTION 05

Fibre-surface engineering and the promise of design-stage mitigation

Design-stage interventions aim to reduce shedding at source rather than capture it after release. The most direct evidence in the supplied set comes from a study of metal oxide nanoparticles (TiO₂, ZnO, MgO) functionalised with fatty acids (oleic acid and stearic acid) applied to polyester fabrics during simulated washing cycles [9]. ZnO and MgO nanoparticles treated with stearic and oleic acid demonstrated a significant reduction in fibre shedding compared with commercial laundry detergent, approximately 46-70% [9]. In contrast, fatty acid adsorption onto TiO₂ was less efficient, with a reduction of about 23%, and the 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 result is notable because it links a surface-property mechanism, hydrophobicity, to a measurable reduction in shedding, and because it reports a dose-response-like differentiation among metal oxides. However, the evidence is from a single study, and the abstract does not report the number of wash cycles, the fabric construction, the durability of the coating after repeated laundering, or the fate of the nanoparticles themselves. Those omissions matter for applied textile manufacturing. A treatment that reduces shedding by 46-70% in a simulated cycle is not yet a manufacturable finish unless it survives realistic laundering, does not impair fabric handle or colour fastness, and does not introduce a new environmental burden. The supplied record supports the mechanism as promising, not as proven at production scale.

The surface-engineering approach also interacts with the material-comparison evidence. If recycled polyester tends to produce shorter fibres and, descriptively, more fibres than virgin polyester [7], then a surface treatment that reduces detachment could be particularly valuable for recycled feedstocks. But the same variability that made the recycled-versus-virgin count difference non-significant [7] means that treatment effects would need to be tested across a sufficiently large and diverse garment sample to distinguish coating performance from base-material and construction variance. The current evidence base does not contain such a study.

A complementary design-stage lever is yarn and thread structure. The finding that ply-twisted filaments emitted approximately 76% less than untwisted filaments, and that coarser threads emitted more than finer ones [5], suggests that twist and linear density are controllable variables with measurable effects. These are conventional textile engineering parameters, which makes them attractive because they do not require novel chemistry. The limitation is that the sewing-thread contribution was approximately 1.09% of total apparel emissions [5], so even a large proportional reduction in thread shedding yields a small absolute reduction. The larger opportunity likely lies in fabric yarn and construction, which the supplied records address

less directly.

SECTION 06

Measurement and analytical advances: enabling better claims, exposing old uncertainties

Progress in mitigation depends on progress in measurement, and the supplied set includes two methodological contributions that address long-standing limitations. The first applies Rock-Eval pyrolysis and oxidation to quantify textile microfibrils from laundry wastewater, 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]. The Tpeak parameter was found to distinguish natural fibres (cotton, linen) from chemical fibres (polyester PET, nylon PA, viscose), and the method was successfully applied to real laundry wastewaters pre-filtered on a silica membrane [4]. This is significant because it enables relative mass quantification of natural and synthetic fibres in the same sample, which is essential for attributing emissions in blended and mixed garments.

The second method combines ICP-AES quantification with FTIR qualitative characterisation for PET microfibrils from infant outerwear, using Fenton oxidation and NaBr density separation as pretreatment [8]. The authors position this against SP-ICP-MS, which they describe as less effective for larger, irregular textile fibres, and report FTIR peaks at 1713, 1251 and 1090 cm⁻¹ confirming PET as the dominant polymer [8]. The value of this workflow is that it converts carbon measurements to PET mass while independently confirming polymer identity, which reduces the risk of misattribution in complex effluent matrices.

These advances do not resolve all comparability problems. The Rock-Eval approach reports relative mass concentrations [4], the ICP-AES approach reports PET mass from a simulated wash [8], the standardised garment study reports fibres per gram and mass per gram under two ISO methods [7], and the acrylic study reports gravimetric mass per kilogram [2]. Each metric answers a different question. A manufacturer seeking to compare two fabric finishes needs a method that is sensitive to the relevant fibre population and that controls for fabric mass, wash programme and cycle number. The supplied literature does not yet converge on a single standard, and the coexistence of count-based, length-based and mass-based claims is a major source of apparent disagreement. The most defensible editorial position is that multi-metric reporting should become the norm, because no single metric captures environmental relevance, analytical detectability and design controllability simultaneously.

A further measurement gap concerns geography and laundering behaviour. One supplied study explicitly notes a research gap in developing nations, using Sri Lanka as a case where mixed laundering habits, including hand washing versus machine washing, and a growing market of affordable synthetic garment imports differ from the Western contexts that dominate the data [10]. This is a reminder that the evidence base is not globally representative, and that interventions designed for machine-washing households may not translate to hand-washing or cold-water-dominant contexts. The study is framed as an introductory quantitative analysis to establish a baseline and identify factors from fabric qualities to consumer habits [10], so it signals a direction rather than providing comparative effect sizes.

CONCLUSION

Conclusions

The supplied evidence supports several robust conclusions and several important cautions. Robustly, microfibre release from laundering is real, measurable and sensitive to laundering parameters: longer cycles, higher temperatures and detergent use increase release [2][8], while later cycles tend to release less than early cycles [2]. Robustly, end-of-pipe filtration can capture a large share of emitted fibres, with reported efficiencies ranging from 26% for one in-drum device to 87% for an external filter by count [1] and up to 83-99% for prototype cartridge systems by the 20th cycle [3]. Robustly, measurement methods are improving, with Rock-Eval pyrolysis able to distinguish natural from chemical fibres [4] and combined ICP-AES/FTIR able to quantify and identify PET microfibrils [8]. Cautiously, material comparisons are contested: recycled polyester shed

more fibres than virgin polyester descriptively but not significantly, while producing significantly shorter fibres [7], which means that recycled content should not be treated as a guarantee of lower shedding. Cautiously, design-stage interventions such as fatty-acid-functionalised metal oxide nanoparticles show promising reductions of approximately 46-70% [9], but durability, scalability and nanoparticle fate remain unaddressed in the supplied record. Cautiously, construction details such as sewing thread twist and linear density measurably affect shedding [5], but the absolute contribution of sewing thread is small at approximately 1.09% of apparel emissions [5]. For applied textile design and manufacturing, the synthesis points to a multi-lever strategy: reduce mechanical and thermal stress where feasible, select yarn and thread structures that resist abrasion, evaluate finishing treatments for shedding performance as well as conventional fabric properties, and treat filtration as a complementary point-of-use measure rather than a substitute for design improvement. Claims about material sustainability should be based on measured shedding performance under standardised, multi-metric conditions rather than on recycled content alone [7].

SCOPE

Limitations

This editorial review is based on ten supplied source records and does not claim systematic-review methods. The evidence base is uneven: some studies report quantitative effect sizes under controlled conditions [1][2][3][5][7][8][9], while others are framed as introductory or focus-setting and do not report comparative outcomes [6][10]. Several findings rest on single studies, including the nanoparticle surface treatment [9], the sewing-thread contribution [5] and the Sri Lankan market baseline [10], so replication is limited. Measurement metrics differ across studies, including fibre count, fibre length, total mass and relative mass concentration, which restricts direct comparison and may explain some apparent disagreements [1][2][3][4][7][8]. The recycled-versus-virgin polyester comparison was not statistically significant for fibre count because of high within-group variability, so it should not be read as evidence of equivalence or of a confirmed difference [7]. Filtration efficiencies are cycle-dependent and may be influenced by declining baseline shedding as well as by capture performance [2][3]. The supplied records do not provide sufficient data on coating durability, nanoparticle release, long-term garment ageing, hand-washing contexts or blended-fibre behaviour. No source reports full life-cycle assessment, so environmental trade-offs of interventions cannot be evaluated from this evidence alone. Finally, the review is AI-assisted and has not been externally peer reviewed; it should be treated as a synthesis of the supplied records rather than as an authoritative

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*.