Measurements of ultrafine particle concentrations and size distribution in an iron foundry
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Abstract

The number and surface area concentration of ultrafine particles in an iron foundry is of interest as freshly generated ultrafine particles are produced by metal melting, pouring and molding processes. This study measured the number and surface area concentrations of ultrafine particles and their size distributions in an iron foundry using a scanning mobility particle sizer (SMPS). The 10–100 nm ultrafine particle number concentrations (NC₀.₀₁–₀.₁) and surface area concentrations (SC₀.₀₁–₀.₁) measured at the iron foundry were 2.07 × 10⁴ to 2.82 × 10⁵ particles cm⁻³ and 67.56 to 2.13 × 10³ /m² cm⁻³, respectively. The concentrations changed dramatically depending on on-site manufacturing conditions. The NC₀.₀₁–₀.₁ levels in the iron foundry were approximately 4.5 times higher on average compared with those in the outdoor ambient environment. These measurement results indicate that the presence of extra particles in the workplace air is within the ultrafine range. Additionally, the analytical results suggest that the number mode diameter can be used to estimate the SC₀.₀₁–₀.₁ levels using the NC₀.₀₁–₀.₁ levels. Moreover, the ultrafine particle number mode diameter was found to be about 46.1 nm in the iron foundry.
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1. Introduction

Ultrafine particles are generally defined as particles with diameters less than 100 nm, and are largely formed through nucleation, gas-to-particle reactions or evaporation/condensation. Recent toxicological and epidemiological studies suggest that adverse pulmonary health effects are associated with freshly generated ultrafine particles [1–5]. Toxicological and epidemiological studies have also shown that ultrafine particles are more harmful from a health perspective than larger particles as smaller particles have a much larger total surface area than larger particles of the same mass, and most ultrafine particles can reach and become deposited in the alveoli region of the lung where they interact with epithelial cells [6–10]. Moreover, ultrafine particles can be transported by the blood to other body organs such as liver within 4–24 h after exposure [3]. Transport of ultrafine particles to the brain via the olfactory nerve has recently been demonstrated [11]. Ultrafine particles concentrations are extremely threatening to environmental health.

Ultrafine particles are typically encountered in the workplace as fumes generated by combustion within saturated vapors arising from processes such as smelting, welding, soldering and plasma spraying [12]. The acute adverse effects on workers exposed to metal fumes have been well documented as metal fume fever (MFF), a self-limited, inflammatory lung disorder. Ultrafine particles play a role in mediating the adverse effects in exposed workers with MFF and other respiratory diseases [13–17]. Additionally, ultrafine particles can be generated by mechanical processes such as grinding, cutting and polishing [18].

Under normal outdoor ambient conditions, measured mean number concentrations of ultrafine particles range between 1.0 × 10⁴ and 2.0 × 10⁴ particles cm⁻³ [9,19–25]. Industrial processes can produce significantly higher concentrations of...
ultrafine particles compared with normal outdoor ambient levels. Number concentrations of ultrafine particles in workplaces are up to $>10^6$ particles cm$^{-3}$ [12,26,27]. Peak concentrations of ultrafine particles in the workplaces can be several times outdoor concentrations, and ultrafine particles generated from industrial combustion processes are important in producing adverse health effects such as respiratory diseases in susceptible individuals. However, little is known about the prevalence and magnitude of ultrafine particle concentrations in the workplace as ultrafine particles have not been as extensively monitored as other particles sizes such as PM$_{10}$, PM$_{2.5}$ or respirable levels.

Many technologies have been developed for measuring ultrafine particles in situ such as the condensation particle counter (CPC), scanning mobility particle sizer (SMPS), electrical low-pressure impactor (ELPI) and nanomicro-orifice cascade impactor (NanoMOUDI). These technologies measure the number, surface area or mass metric directly or indirectly [28]. Due to a lack of suitable personal samplers for ultrafine particles to assess workplace exposure and risk, measurements at fixed locations are normally adopted to determine the characteristics of worker exposure to ultrafine particles.

Ultrafine particles can be produced in iron foundry as freshly generated ultrafine particles by metal melting, pouring and molding processes. Chang et al. [29] reported that mass concentrations of PM$_{2.5}$ increased when the pouring and shakeout processes commenced in a gray iron metal casting foundry. Ultrafine particles contributed less than 1% of PM$_{2.5}$ mass, but nearly all of the particle numbers. Additionally, Evans et al. [30] measured that particle number concentrations in an automotive grey iron foundry were $7.01 \times 10^4$ to $2.76 \times 10^5$ particles cm$^{-3}$ within the size range 10–300 nm. This study measured the number and surface area concentrations of ultrafine particles and their size distributions in an iron foundry using an SMPS to provide a more complete presentation of size-fractionated ultrafine particle characteristics via field sampling.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Sampling site

The sampling site in this study is the casting area in an iron foundry (asterisk in Fig. 1). The iron casting operation comprises material charging, metal melting, sand mixing, molding, mold assembly, pouring, cooling, shakeout, finishing, heat treatment and inspection.

The operations performed in this sampling area are melting of raw materials, such as cast iron and steel, in a mid-frequency electric arc furnace; the heat generated by electrical power melts the solid metal into molten metal. The molten metal is then poured into a crane ladle. An overhead crane moves the crane ladle loaded with molten metal from the furnace area to the pouring area. At the pouring area, the molten metal in the crane ladle is transferred to a pouring ladle. Bottom pouring is then utilized to pour the molten metal into sand molds produced by an automatic molding machine. The casting piece is sent to the next operation area via a conveyer running through a cooling tunnel. The primary emission source of ultrafine particles in this operation area is generated by the operation of pouring high-temperature molten metal from the melting furnace into the crane ladle, and the subsequent operation of pouring the molten metal in crane ladle into the pouring ladle. The molten metal temperature during pouring is 1480–1520 °C.

2.2. Sampling equipment

Notably, SMPSs have been used in numerous laboratory and field studies. The SMPS system measures the number size distribution of ultrafine particles using an electrical mobility separation technique. In this study, a TSI Model 3936 Scanning Mobility Particle Sizer (TSI Inc., Shoreview, MN, USA) was utilized to measure ultrafine particles in an iron foundry. The two primary components of the TSI Model 3936 SMPS are a TSI Model 3080 Electrostatic Classifier which includes a TSI Model 3081 Differential Mobility Analyzer, and a TSI Model 3022A Condensation Particle Counter. Maximum particle concentration for the TSI Model 3022A CPC is $10^7$ particles cm$^{-3}$. To obtain a full-size distribution of an aerosol, the SMPS is exponentially scanned by the Aerosol Instrument Manager software (AIM software).

2.3. Experimental design

The SMPS was set up in a sampling chamber to measure ultrafine particle concentrations in the workplace. A portable air conditioner was employed to keep the sampling chamber temperature <30 °C, and ensure that the CPC could be operated normally in a hot environment. The cool air generated from an air conditioner was introduced to the sampling chamber through a duct and discharged from the chamber bottom. The inlet of the sampling chamber was located at adult breathing height, roughly 1.5 m above the ground. Air was sampled through a Tygon tube roughly 0.5 m long from the sampling inlet to the SMPS. Fig. 1 shows the location of the SMPS. In this study, the SMPS was...
operated at a sheath-to-sample flow ratio of 10:1. Sample flow rate in this experiment was adjusted to 1.5 L/min with a sheath air flow rate of 15 L/min to permit measuring ultrafine particles from 6 to 225 nm in diameter that were classified into 102 divisions, and to minimize diffusion losses of ultrafine particles during sampling. The SMPS data were saved at 2.25-min intervals by one scan when the SMPS up-scan time and retrace time were 120 and 15 s, respectively. The 10–100 nm ultrafine particle number concentrations (NC0.01–0.1) and surface area concentrations (SC0.01–0.1) were calculated from SMPS raw data. The surface area concentration was estimated from the number concentration by assuming a spherical particle geometry for the ultrafine particle. The sampling instrument was operated continuously for approximately 6–7 h during each on-site sampling period from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. The ultrafine particle concentrations and size distributions were measured on two workdays at the iron foundry. An independent sample t-test was performed to test differences between two different sampling periods for NC0.01–0.1 and SC0.01–0.1 levels. A significance level of 0.05 was used for all statistical tests.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Ultrafine particle number and surface area concentrations

Fig. 2a and b presents the time variations of NC0.01–0.1 and SC0.01–0.1 levels over the each sampling period. Measurement results obtained on Day 1, for NC0.01–0.1 levels were 2.09 × 10^4 to 2.82 × 10^5 particles cm\(^{-3}\) (mean 8.33 × 10^4 particles cm\(^{-3}\)), and SC0.01–0.1 levels were 2.09 × 10^2 to 2.13 × 10^3 \(\mu^2\) cm\(^{-3}\) (mean 6.32 × 10^2 \(\mu^2\) cm\(^{-3}\)). On Day 2, NC0.01–0.1 levels were 2.07 × 10^4 to 2.82 × 10^5 particles cm\(^{-3}\) (mean 5.73 × 10^4 particles cm\(^{-3}\)) and SC0.01–0.1 levels were 67.56 to 1.95 × 10^5 \(\mu^2\) cm\(^{-3}\) (mean 3.03 × 10^2 \(\mu^2\) cm\(^{-3}\)). Measurement results show that the great variability existed in both ultrafine particle number and surface area concentrations. Ultrafine particle number and surface area concentrations differed significantly between Days 1 and 2 (\(p<0.001\) for NC0.01–0.1; \(p<0.001\) for SC0.01–0.1). Measurement results indicate that the concentrations of ultrafine particles changed rapidly.

Based on the two on-site sampling results, the NC0.01–0.1 and SC0.01–0.1 levels measured at the iron foundry changed dramatically based on on-site manufacturing conditions. For instance, the composition of raw materials or the proportion of additives, such as nodulant and inoculant, can differ for different products and affect the ultrafine particle concentrations generated during casting operations. Variations in NC0.01–0.1 and SC0.01–0.1 levels during the sampling period may come from different operations. For example, fresh metal oxide fumes were emitted from the furnace and ultrafine particle levels increased when the furnace cover was opened for pouring. Based on workplace observations one could pinpoint the various activities and sources responsible for temporal variations in ultrafine particle number concentrations at a fixed location. Chang et al. [29] also pointed out that flame conditions, vaporization, thermal decomposition of organic materials, and the variability of a mold breakup during shakeout affect PM emission rates.

The NC0.01–0.1 levels in the environment outside the factory were about 1.26 × 10^4 to 1.89 × 10^4 particles cm\(^{-3}\), obtained by four SMPS scans during the two on-site sampling periods. Measurement results for outdoor NC0.01–0.1 levels are similar to measurement results obtained by Tuch et al. [19], Ruuskanen et al. [22] and Pekkanen et al. [9], who measured outdoor ambient NC0.01–0.1 levels in eastern Germany (mean NC0.01–0.1 = 1.31 × 10^4 particles cm\(^{-3}\)), in three European cities (mean NC0.01–0.1 = 1.62 × 10^4 to 1.83 × 10^4 particles cm\(^{-3}\))
and in Helsinki (mean NC_{0.01–0.1} = 1.49 × 10^4 particles cm\(^{-3}\)), respectively. Additionally, Rodríguez et al. [31] obtained similar results, indicating that NC_{0.01–0.1} levels measured in Milan, Barcelona and London were 2.06 × 10^4, 1.44 × 10^4 and 9.33 × 10^3 particles cm\(^{-3}\), respectively. In this field study, the NC_{0.01–0.1} levels in an iron foundry were approximately 4.5 times higher on average compared with the outdoor ambient environment. This measurement result is similar to that obtained by Wake et al. [12], who reported that the ultrafine particle levels generated by a casting process in a zinc refinery were 2.8–4.3 times higher than those outside the refinery. These measurement results indicate that the presence of extra particles in the workplace air is within the ultrafine range. Additionally, the ultrafine particle concentrations generated from different indoor activities had been measured by Wallace [32]. The NC_{0.01–0.1} levels range from 3.1 × 10^3 to 4.7 × 10^4 particles cm\(^{-3}\) for different indoor activities. The average NC_{0.01–0.1} levels in an iron foundry are approximately 1.5–22.8 times higher than those indoor activities.

**Fig. 3** shows the relationship between NC_{0.01–0.1} and SC_{0.01–0.1} derived from SMPS measurements. The linear regression relationship existing between NC_{0.01–0.1} and SC_{0.01–0.1} can be expressed as
\[ Y = 7.32 \times 10^{-3}X - 31.95 \ (R^2 = 0.872), \]
where \( X \) is the NC_{0.01–0.1} levels (in particles cm\(^{-3}\)), and \( Y \) is the SC_{0.01–0.1} levels (in \( \mu m^2 \) cm\(^{-3}\)). The analytical result from the slope of the linear regression indicates that the characteristic diameter of ultrafine particles (10–100 nm) is about 0.483 \( \mu m \) in this iron foundry. This analytical result suggests that NC_{0.01–0.1} levels can be a reasonably good indicator of SC_{0.01–0.1} levels with diameters the characteristic of ultrafine particles at this iron foundry. That is, the relationship between the NC_{0.01–0.1} and SC_{0.01–0.1} can be re-expressed as
\[ SC_{0.01–0.1} = \pi d^2 NC_{0.01–0.1}, \]
where \( d \) is 0.483 \( \mu m \).

**3.2. Ultrafine particle number and surface area size distribution**

**Fig. 4**a and b shows average particle number and surface area size distributions measured on two workdays by averaging data from the 375 scans by the SMPS. (a) Particle number size distribution and (b) particle surface area size distribution.
ity were $2.02 \times 10^5$ and $4.84 \times 10^5$ particles cm$^{-3}$ in spring and winter, respectively; particles were within the size range $10$–$300$ nm. The number concentrations inside the facility were $15$–$150$ times greater than those outside the facility and were highly dependent on the season. Measurement results obtained by Peters et al. for particle number concentrations in an engine machining and assembly facility were about $2.5$–$5.9$ times higher than those measured in this study. Evans et al. [30] measured that particle number concentrations for the particle size range $10$–$300$ nm in an automotive grey iron foundry were $1.18 \times 10^5$ particles cm$^{-3}$ at the core-mould production area, $1.71 \times 10^5$ particles cm$^{-3}$ at the shakeout-cleaning area and $1.60 \times 10^6$ particles cm$^{-3}$ at the operator station near the furnace in summer. Additionally, the geometric mean number concentrations were $2.09 \times 10^5$ to $2.39 \times 10^5$ particles cm$^{-3}$, $1.75 \times 10^5$ to $2.76 \times 10^5$ particles cm$^{-3}$ and $7.01 \times 10^4$ to $1.68 \times 10^5$ particles cm$^{-3}$ in winter, spring and summer, respectively, at different areas. Measurement results obtained by Evans et al. for particle number concentrations in an automotive grey iron foundry were about $0.9$–$3.4$ times those measured in this study.

The particle number mode, median, mean and geometric mean diameter were $46.1$, $37.1$, $46.2$ and $35.5$ nm, respectively, and the geometric standard deviation was $2.1$. The particle number concentrations increased as particle diameters decreased when ultrafine particle diameters were $<7$ nm (Fig. 4a). The substantial amounts of ultrafine particles in this study can be attributed to fresh fumes emitted from the furnace during pouring, these particles, a few nanometers in size, were under the lower detection limit of the SMPS since the SMPS only scanned down to $6$ nm. Moreover, the number median diameter of ultrafine particles measured in this study was about $0.6$ times smaller than that obtained by Wake et al. [12] for a molding area at a steel foundry. Beside, the particle number mode diameter measured in this study was about $1.2$–$1.3$ times larger than that obtained by Rodríguez et al. [31] in the urban environment in western Europe. This comparison result indicated that the particle number mode diameter in the iron foundry was larger than that in the urban environment. Additionally, the analytical characteristic diameter from slope of the linear regression (Fig. 3), $48.3$ nm, is close to the number mode diameter of ultrafine particles at this iron foundry, $46.1$ nm. That is, the number mode diameter of ultrafine particles and the NC$_{0.01}$–$0.1$ levels can be utilized to roughly estimate the SC$_{0.01}$–$0.1$ levels.

Additionally, average particle surface area concentration over the two on-site sampling periods was $8.59 \times 10^2$ $\mu$m$^2$ cm$^{-3}$ for particles sized $6$–$225$ nm. The particle surface area mode, median, mean and geometric mean diameter were $88.2$, $92.0$, $101.2$ and $86.9$ nm, respectively, and the geometric standard deviation was $1.8$. Shi et al. [33] determined that the particle surface area concentrations in the ambient environment at Birmingham and Harwell were about $1.2 \times 10^2$ $\mu$m$^2$ cm$^{-3}$ (range, $14$–$723$ nm) and $3.0 \times 10^2$ $\mu$m$^2$ cm$^{-3}$ (range, $11$–$445$ nm), respectively. Moreover, ultrafine particle surface area mode diameters in the ambient environment at Birmingham and Harwell were $250$ and $230$ nm, respectively. Beside, Rodriguez et al. [31] obtained similar results, indicating that particle sur-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ultratine particle size (nm)</th>
<th>10–18</th>
<th>18–32</th>
<th>32–56</th>
<th>56–100</th>
<th>100–180</th>
<th>10–100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number concentration ( (\text{particles cm}^{-3}) )</td>
<td>( 3.20 \times 10^4 )</td>
<td>( 8.88 \times 10^4 )</td>
<td>( 3.03 \times 10^4 )</td>
<td>( 1.02 \times 10^5 )</td>
<td>( 2.58 \times 10^5 )</td>
<td>( 2.82 \times 10^5 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>4.84 ( \times 10^5 )</td>
<td>7.46 ( \times 10^5 )</td>
<td>5.46 ( \times 10^5 )</td>
<td>1.92 ( \times 10^6 )</td>
<td>8.22 ( \times 10^5 )</td>
<td>1.09 ( \times 10^6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.10 ( \times 10^3 )</td>
<td>3.03 ( \times 10^3 )</td>
<td>3.05 ( \times 10^3 )</td>
<td>1.93 ( \times 10^3 )</td>
<td>1.69 ( \times 10^4 )</td>
<td>7.26 ( \times 10^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ( (\text{S.D.}) )</td>
<td>1.29 ( \times 10^4 ) ( (5.46 \times 10^3) )</td>
<td>3.03 ( \times 10^4 ) ( (1.12 \times 10^4) )</td>
<td>1.02 ( \times 10^5 ) ( (2.25 \times 10^4) )</td>
<td>2.58 ( \times 10^5 ) ( (2.05 \times 10^4) )</td>
<td>2.58 ( \times 10^5 ) ( (2.02) )</td>
<td>2.82 ( \times 10^5 ) ( (1.99) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometric mean ( (G.S.D.) )</td>
<td>( 3.03 \times 10^5 ) ( (1.90) )</td>
<td>( 3.03 \times 10^4 ) ( (1.199) )</td>
<td>( 1.02 \times 10^5 ) ( (1.99) )</td>
<td>( 1.92 \times 10^6 ) ( (1.80) )</td>
<td>( 2.58 \times 10^5 ) ( (2.02) )</td>
<td>( 2.82 \times 10^5 ) ( (1.99) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
The particle surface area concentrations in five selected fractions: 10–18, 18–32, 32–56, 56–100 and 100–180 nm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ultrafine particle size (nm)</th>
<th>10–18</th>
<th>18–32</th>
<th>32–56</th>
<th>56–100</th>
<th>100–180</th>
<th>10–100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface area concentration (μm² cm⁻³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>2.07 × 10⁴</td>
<td>1.94 × 10⁴</td>
<td>1.76 × 10⁴</td>
<td>1.53 × 10⁴</td>
<td>1.19 × 10⁴</td>
<td>7.26 × 10³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (S.D.)</td>
<td>6.74 (3.58)</td>
<td>5.34 (2.27)</td>
<td>4.31 (2.98)</td>
<td>3.38 (2.45)</td>
<td>2.64 (2.20)</td>
<td>1.82 (1.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometric mean (G.S.D.)</td>
<td>5.73 (3.86)</td>
<td>4.52 (3.07)</td>
<td>3.76 (3.02)</td>
<td>3.27 (2.91)</td>
<td>2.90 (2.50)</td>
<td>2.30 (2.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The particle surface area mode diameters in the urban fine aerosols in Milan, Barcelona and London were 233, 179 and 198 nm, respectively. Compared with measurement results obtained by Shi et al. for particle surface area concentrations in an ambient environment were lower than those in the iron foundry by about 0.1–0.3 times and ultrafine particle surface area mode diameters in the ambient environment were larger than those in the iron foundry by about 2.6–2.8 times. These comparison results indicate that this workplace contained large number of ultrafine fume particles produced by gas-to-particle conversion. This high particle surface area concentration in the workplace can have adverse health effects. Additionally, the much lower surface area mode diameter in the foundry is caused by the much stronger formation rates of ultrafine particles than of ambient particles.

Table 1 shows the particle number concentrations in five selected fractions: 10–18, 18–32, 32–56, 56–100 and 100–180 nm for the whole measuring period of two workdays. Mean particle number concentrations for these five selected fractions were 1.02 × 10⁴ particles cm⁻³ (13.34%), 1.77 × 10⁴ particles cm⁻³ (23.28%), 2.58 × 10⁴ particles cm⁻³ (33.95%), 1.69 × 10⁴ particles cm⁻³ (22.18%) and 5.52 × 10³ particles cm⁻³ (7.25%), respectively, and the mean NC₀.01–0.1 level was 7.06 × 10⁴ particles cm⁻³. The highest and second highest number concentrations of ultrafine particles were in fractions 32–56 and 18–32 nm, respectively, at the iron foundry. The measurement results indicated that the mean number concentrations over selected fractions were governed by particles in the size range 32–56 nm. During the two on-site sampling periods, the maximum and minimum particle number concentrations were 1.29 × 10⁵ particles cm⁻³ (32–56 nm fraction) and 7.26 × 10² particles cm⁻³ (100–180 nm fraction), respectively.

Table 2 shows the particle surface area concentrations for the five selected fractions: 10–18, 18–32, 32–56, 56–100 and 100–180 nm. Mean particle surface area concentrations for these five selected fractions were 6.74 μm² cm⁻³ (0.87%), 35.41 μm² cm⁻³ (4.56%), 1.53 × 10² μm² cm⁻³ (19.68%), 2.89 × 10² μm² cm⁻³ (37.22%) and 2.92 × 10² μm² cm⁻³ (37.62%), respectively, and the mean SC₀.01–0.1 level was 4.84 × 10² μm² cm⁻³. The highest and second highest surface area concentrations of ultrafine particles were in fractions 100–180 and 56–100 nm, respectively. The measurement results suggested that the mean surface area concentrations over selected fractions were governed by particles in the size range 100–180 nm. During the two on-site sampling periods, the maximum and minimum particle surface area concentrations were 1.50 × 10³ μm² cm⁻³ (100–180 nm fraction) and 0.76 μm² cm⁻³ (10–18 nm fraction), respectively.

4. Conclusions

The NC₀.01–0.1 and SC₀.01–0.1 levels measured at the iron foundry were 2.07 × 10⁴ to 2.82 × 10⁵ particles cm⁻³ and 67.56 to 2.13 × 10³ μm² cm⁻³, respectively. The concentrations changed dramatically depending on on-site manufacturing conditions. That is, ultrafine particle number and surface area concentration exposure can vary as a function of time at the iron
foundry. The NC_{0.01–0.1} levels in the iron foundry were approximately 4.5 times higher on average compared with those in the outdoor ambient environment. These measurement results indicate that the presence of extra particles in the workplace within the ultrafine range. Additionally, the analytical results suggest that the number mode diameter of ultrafine particles can be used to roughly estimate SC_{0.01–0.1} levels using the NC_{0.01–0.1} levels. Moreover, the particle number mode diameter was found to be about 46.1 nm in the iron foundry.
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