

REVIEW ARTICLE

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

Evidence from controlled laundering studies, filtration technologies and fibre-level design factors

JAT Editorial Office

academic@curtains.vip

ABSTRACT

Domestic laundering of synthetic textiles is a recognised pathway for microfibre release into aquatic environments [1][2][4]. This editorial review synthesises findings from ten supplied studies to examine the mechanisms, measurement approaches and mitigation strategies associated with microfibre shedding. Evidence indicates that release is influenced by washing parameters such as time, temperature and detergent use [2], by fibre type and textile construction [5][7], and by finishing treatments [6][9]. Filtration technologies show variable but promising retention efficiencies, ranging from 26% for a laundry ball to over 90% for inline filters under specific conditions [1][3]. However, methodological heterogeneity across studies—including differences in fabric preparation, washing conditions and quantification techniques—limits direct comparison and generalisability [4][8]. Disagreements persist regarding the relative shedding of recycled versus virgin synthetics [7] and the contribution of non-fabric components such as sewing threads [5]. Practical implications for textile design and manufacturing include selecting fibre types and thread constructions that minimise fragmentation, applying surface treatments that reduce fibre loss, and integrating filtration systems at the appliance level. Standardisation of test methods and reporting metrics is essential for robust comparative assessment and for informing evidence-based design decisions.

Keywords: microfibre release; synthetic textiles; laundering; filtration technologies; textile design; microplastic pollution; standardisation

SECTION 01

Introduction: Scope and Significance of Microfibre Release

Microfibre pollution from synthetic textiles has emerged as a significant environmental concern, with domestic laundering identified as a primary emission pathway [1][2][4]. Synthetic fibres such as polyester, acrylic and nylon constitute approximately 60% of global textile fibre consumption [2], and their mechanical abrasion during washing releases thousands of fibres per wash into effluent streams [1]. These microfibres, defined as fibres with a length of less than 5 mm, are considered high-concern pollutants due to their continuous and cumulative entry into aquatic environments [3]. The environmental persistence and potential ecological impacts of these particles have driven research into quantification methods, release mechanisms and mitigation technologies.

The supplied evidence base spans controlled laboratory studies, technology evaluations and material comparisons, reflecting a maturing but still fragmented field. Studies have examined release from specific fibre types such as acrylic [2] and polyester [8][9], assessed the efficacy of filtration devices [1][3], and explored the influence of textile construction parameters including sewing threads [5] and finishing treatments [6]. Comparative analyses of recycled versus virgin synthetics have also begun to challenge assumptions about the environmental performance of recycled materials [7]. This review synthesises these findings to identify consistent patterns, unresolved disagreements and practical implications for textile design and manufacturing.

A critical challenge across the evidence base is the heterogeneity of methodological approaches. Quantification techniques range from gravimetric analysis [2] and filtration-based counting [1] to advanced instrumental methods such as Rock-Eval pyrolysis [4] and ICP-AES with FTIR [8]. Washing conditions vary in temperature, duration, detergent use and appliance type, including portable washers [2], household machines [3] and colour fastness testers [8]. This variability complicates direct comparison of release rates and mitigation efficiencies, and it underscores the need for standardised protocols that can support robust cross-study synthesis.

SECTION 02

Mechanisms and Parameters Influencing Microfibre Release

The release of microfibrils during laundering is driven by mechanical and chemical stresses acting on textile structures. Mahbub and Shams [2] demonstrated that increasing washing time from 30 to 60 minutes doubled microfibre release from acrylic fabrics, attributing this to prolonged mechanical stresses and rotational forces. The same study found that washing at 40 degrees C released approximately 1.8 times more microfibrils than at 20 degrees C, and that detergent use increased release to 162.49 +/- 44.21 mg/kg compared to 60.22 +/- 13.32 mg/kg without detergent. These findings indicate that both thermal and chemical factors modulate fibre fragmentation, likely through fibre swelling, surface degradation and enhanced mechanical action.

Release patterns also change over successive wash cycles. Mahbub and Shams [2] reported that microfibre release decreased by 45% during the 7th washing cycle and by 67% during the 7th drying cycle compared to the first cycle, suggesting that loosely bound fibres are removed early and that subsequent releases reflect more structurally integrated material. This temporal dimension has implications for interpreting single-cycle laboratory results and for estimating lifetime emissions from garments. It also highlights the importance of reporting cycle numbers and cumulative release when comparing studies.

Fibre and textile construction parameters further influence shedding. Rathinamoorthy and Raja Balasaraswathi [5] found that sewing threads release an average of 2.65 +/- 0.70 microfibrils per metre during laundering, with sewing-induced damage increasing release by approximately 114% compared to threads washed before sewing. Coarser threads with higher Tex values released more microfibrils, with an 80 Tex spun thread showing a 22-150% increase compared to a 20 Tex spun thread. Ply-twisted filaments exhibited approximately 76% lower emissions than untwisted filaments, indicating that twist structure can mitigate fragmentation. Although sewing threads contributed only about 1.09% of total apparel microfibre emissions in that study, the findings identify a design lever that is often overlooked in fibre-level assessments.

SECTION 03

Measurement Approaches and Analytical Uncertainty

Quantifying microfibre release accurately is methodologically demanding due to the diversity of fibre shapes, sizes and polymer types. McIlwraith et al. [1] adapted existing methods to measure length, count and weight of microfibrils in laundry effluent, enabling assessment of mitigation technologies. Mahbub and Shams [2] used gravimetric analysis to determine net weight of released microfibrils, reporting mean length and diameter of approximately 2411 +/- 1500 um and 18 +/- 4 um respectively. These physical dimensions illustrate the variability inherent in textile-derived particles and the challenge of applying a single analytical approach across fibre types.

Advanced instrumental methods offer complementary capabilities. Romero-Sarmiento et al. [4] developed a Rock-Eval pyrolysis and oxidation procedure for relative mass quantification of natural and synthetic microfibrils, demonstrating that the Tpeak parameter can distinguish between natural fibres such as cotton and linen and chemical fibres including polyester, nylon and viscose. The method was successfully applied to real laundry wastewater pre-filtered on a silica membrane, and results were not affected by polymer shape (fibre versus pellet) or fibre nature. This approach addresses a key limitation of techniques that rely on particle counting alone, namely the difficulty of converting counts to mass-based emission estimates.

Zhang et al. [8] combined ICP-AES and FTIR to quantify and characterise PET microfibre emissions from infant outerwear, converting carbon measurements to PET mass and confirming polymer identity through characteristic FTIR peaks at 1713, 1251 and 1090 cm⁻¹. They noted that SP-ICP-MS is less effective for larger, irregular textile fibres, highlighting a size-domain limitation in some analytical techniques. The diversity of validated methods-gravimetric, pyrolysis-based, spectroscopic and counting-based-means that reported release rates are not directly interchangeable across studies. This methodological pluralism is a strength for triangulation but a weakness for comparative meta-analysis, and it reinforces the need for interlaboratory standardisation and reporting of method-specific uncertainties.

SECTION 04

Mitigation Technologies: Filtration and Appliance-Level Interventions

Filtration technologies represent a direct intervention point for reducing microfibre emissions from washing machines. McIlwraith et al. [1] evaluated two marketed technologies, the Cora Ball and the Lint LUV-R filter, finding that both significantly reduced microfibre numbers from fleece blankets. The Lint LUV-R captured an average of 87% of microfibres by count, compared to 26% for the Cora Ball, and also significantly reduced total weight and average fibre length in effluent. This substantial difference in performance illustrates that device design and retention mechanism materially affect efficacy, and that not all marketed solutions deliver comparable reductions.

Belzagui et al. [3] proposed four sustainable filtering systems using replaceable cartridges partially filled with recycled low-density polyethylene pellets. Retention efficiency varied by arrangement and cycle number: filter F1 (4 cm diameter, 30 cm height) retained more than 50% of microfibres at the 10th cycle, 66% at the 20th and greater than 80% at the 20th for a different metric; filter F2 (6.3 cm diameter, 41 cm height) achieved greater than 90% at the 20th cycle; filter F3, with reversed flow, reached almost 100% at the 15th cycle; and filter F4, integrated with the existing washing machine filter, achieved greater than 90% at the 20th cycle. Across arrangements, retention was estimated between 52% and 86% in the first cycle and up to 83-99% in the 20th cycle, with cartridges lasting more than 30 washing cycles. These results suggest that filtration can be highly effective, but performance depends on system geometry, flow configuration and operational lifetime.

The evidence on filtration is promising but not yet sufficient for universal recommendations. McIlwraith et al. [1] noted that further research is needed to understand other sources of microfibre emissions, and Belzagui et al. [3] stated that no feasible alternatives existed at the time of their study. Differences in test fabrics, washing conditions and quantification methods between these studies limit direct comparison of retention efficiencies. Nevertheless, the convergence of findings that inline or cartridge-based filters can achieve high retention rates supports their consideration as appliance-level mitigation measures, provided that maintenance, replacement and disposal of captured fibres are managed to avoid secondary environmental release.

SECTION 05

Material and Design Factors: Fibre Type, Recycled Content and Finishing

Fibre type and textile construction are increasingly recognised as determinants of microfibre shedding. Gundogdu et al. [7] analysed 51 garments from five global fashion brands, comparing cotton, virgin polyester, recycled polyester (rPET), virgin polyamide and recycled polyamide under two internationally recognised laundering methods. Descriptively, rPET released the highest mean number of microfibres (12430 fibres g⁻¹), approximately 55% more than virgin polyester (8028 fibres g⁻¹), although this difference was not statistically significant across material categories due to high within-group variability. Fibre length differed significantly by material type, with rPET and recycled polyamide producing significantly shorter fibres (mean 0.42 mm) than cotton and virgin polyester (mean 0.52 mm). Cotton released a greater total fibre mass (1.85 mg g⁻¹) but with longer and fewer fibres. These findings challenge assumptions that recycled polyester is inherently a lower-shedding alternative and emphasise the need for performance-based evaluation rather than material-category generalisation.

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 synthetics [7]. This suggests that textile design and manufacturing practices, including yarn spinning, fabric construction and finishing, may influence shedding intensity independently of fibre category. The observation that within-group variability was high enough to obscure statistical significance for the recycled versus virgin comparison indicates that material labelling alone is an insufficient predictor of environmental performance.

Finishing treatments and surface modifications offer additional design levers. Meerthiga et al. [6] focused specifically on how different textile finishing treatments influence microplastic fibre release during laundering, although the supplied abstract does not report quantitative outcomes. Alves et al. [9] investigated metal oxide nanoparticles (TiO₂, ZnO, MgO) functionalised with fatty acids (oleic acid and stearic acid) as microfiber-retaining agents on polyester fabrics. ZnO and MgO nanoparticles 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 a reduction of approximately 23%. The authors attributed the limited performance of TiO₂-based systems to insufficient hydrophobic interaction. These results indicate that surface chemistry and nanoparticle selection materially affect treatment efficacy, and that functionalisation strategies can be tailored to reduce fibre loss during washing.

SECTION 06

Geographical and Contextual Gaps in the Evidence Base

The supplied studies predominantly reflect laboratory or simulated laundering conditions in high-income contexts, with limited representation of developing-nation laundering practices. Ashirwadane et al. [10] explicitly identified a research gap in Sri Lanka, noting that mixed laundering habits including hand washing and washing machines, combined with a growing market of affordable synthetic garment imports, present a context different from Western settings where most data are available. Their introductory study aimed to quantify microfiber shedding from Sri Lankan retail garments and to identify key factors from fabric qualities to consumer laundering habits, establishing a baseline for future mitigation strategies. This contextual gap matters because washing machine type, water availability, detergent formulations and garment care practices vary widely across regions and can influence release rates.

Similarly, Zhang et al. [8] focused on infant PET outerwear, addressing early-life exposure concerns and the vulnerability of infant physiological systems. Their simulation used a colour fastness tester at 20-40 degrees C, with PET microfiber release increasing from 1.75 to 2.53 mg as temperature rose, averaging 2.18 mg. This study illustrates how specific product categories and user groups can warrant targeted investigation, and how analytical method development can be driven by the need to characterise release from particular garment types. However, the small scale and specific conditions of such studies limit generalisation to broader populations and laundering scenarios.

The evidence base also varies in the degree to which it addresses real-world wastewater treatment and environmental fate. Romero-Sarmiento et al. [4] noted that only a portion of microfibres is retained in wastewater treatment plants, and their method was applied to real laundry wastewaters pre-filtered on a silica membrane. This connection between laundering effluent and treatment infrastructure is important for estimating environmental loading, yet most supplied studies focus on release at the washing machine outlet rather than on downstream retention or fate. Integrating laundering, filtration and treatment perspectives would strengthen the evidence base for policy and design decisions.

CONCLUSION

Conclusions

The supplied evidence establishes that microfiber release from laundering synthetic textiles is a multifactorial phenomenon influenced by washing parameters [2], fibre and textile construction [5][7], finishing treatments [6][9] and appliance-level filtration [1][3]. Filtration technologies can achieve high retention rates under specific conditions, with inline filters and cartridge systems reporting efficiencies from approximately 50% to over 90% depending on design and cycle number [1][3].

However, methodological heterogeneity across studies-including differences in quantification methods [4][8], washing conditions [2][8] and fabric preparation [1][7]-limits direct comparison and generalisation. Disagreements persist regarding the relative shedding of recycled versus virgin synthetics [7] and the contribution of non-fabric components such as sewing threads [5]. For applied textile design and manufacturing, the evidence supports prioritising fibre types and thread constructions that reduce fragmentation [5], applying surface treatments that lower fibre loss [9], and considering filtration integration at the appliance level [1][3]. Standardisation of test methods and reporting metrics is essential for robust comparative assessment and for informing evidence-based design decisions. Future research should address geographical and contextual gaps [10], incorporate downstream fate and treatment considerations [4], and clarify the influence of finishing treatments on shedding [6].

SCOPE

Limitations

This editorial review is based solely on the ten supplied source records and does not claim systematic-review methods. The evidence base is heterogeneous in methodology, including gravimetric analysis [2], filtration-based counting [1], Rock-Eval pyrolysis [4], ICP-AES with FTIR [8] and standardised laundering protocols [7], which limits direct comparison of release rates and mitigation efficiencies. Several sources are conference proceedings or introductory studies with limited quantitative detail [6][10], and some findings are descriptive without statistical significance testing [7]. The review does not include primary data collection, meta-analysis or quality appraisal using formal risk-of-bias tools. Publication bias and language bias cannot be assessed from the supplied records. The practical implications are therefore indicative rather than prescriptive, and they should be interpreted in light of the specific conditions, materials and analytical methods reported in each study.

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*.