Office de la Propriété Intellectuelle du Canada
Un organisme d'Industrie Canada

Canadian Intellectual Property Office
An agency of Industry Canada

CA 2707515 C 2016/02/16

(11)(21) **2 707 515**

(12) BREVET CANADIEN / CANADIAN PATENT

(13) **C**

(86) **Date de dépôt PCT/PCT Filing Date:** 2008/09/18
(87) **Date publication PCT/PCT Publication Date:** 2009/03/26
(45) **Date de délivrance/Issue Date:** 2016/02/16
(85) **Entrée phase nationale/National Entry:** 2010/02/10
(86) **N° demande PCT/PCT Application No.:** US 2008/010840
(87) **N° publication PCT/PCT Publication No.:** 2009/038735
(30) **Priorités/Priorities:** 2007/09/19 (US60/994,483); 2008/09/17 (US12/284,148)

(51) **Cl.Int./Int.Cl.** ***D21H 27/00*** (2006.01), ***B08B 1/00*** (2006.01)

(72) **Inventeurs/Inventors:**
SUMNICHT, DANIEL W., US;
MILLER, JOSEPH H., US

(73) **Propriétaire/Owner:**
GEORGIA-PACIFIC CONSUMER PRODUCTS LP, US

(74) **Agent:** NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT CANADA LLP/S.E.N.C.R.L., S.R.L.

(54) **Titre : CHIFFON CELLULOSIQUE JETABLE A EFFICACITE ELEVEE**
(54) **Title: HIGH EFFICIENCY DISPOSABLE CELLULOSIC WIPER**

(57) **Abrégé/Abstract:**
A high efficiency disposable cellulosic wiper includes (a) pulp-derived papermaking fiber; (b) up to 75% by weight regenerated cellulosic microfiber having a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml, the microfiber being selected and present in amounts such that the wiper exhibits a Laplace pore volume fraction at pore sizes less than 15 microns of at least 1.5 times that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated cellulose microfiber. The wipers of the invention exhibit remarkable residue removal efficiency.

(12) INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY (PCT)

(19) World Intellectual Property Organization
International Bureau

(43) International Publication Date
26 March 2009 (26.03.2009)

PCT

(10) International Publication Number
WO 2009/038735 A1

(51) International Patent Classification:
B32B 5/00 (2006.01)

(21) International Application Number:
PCT/US2008/010840

(22) International Filing Date:
18 September 2008 (18.09.2008)

(25) Filing Language: English

(26) Publication Language: English

(30) Priority Data:

60/994,483	19 September 2007 (19.09.2007)	US
12/284,148	17 September 2008 (17.09.2008)	US

(71) Applicant *(for all designated States except US)*: **GEORGIA-PACIFIC CONSUMER PRODUCTS LP** [US/US]; 133 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30303 (US).

(72) Inventors; and

(75) Inventors/Applicants *(for US only)*: **SUMNICHT, Daniel W.** [US/US]; 1754 Berkshire Drive, Hobart, Wisconsin 54313 (US). **MILLER, Joseph H.** [US/US]; 1261 Nature Trail Drive, Neenah, Wisconsin 54956 (US).

(74) Agent: **LEE, Eric M.**; Patent Group GA030-43, Georgia-Pacific LLC, 133 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30303 (US).

(81) Designated States *(unless otherwise indicated, for every kind of national protection available)*: AE, AG, AL, AM, AO, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BH, BR, BW, BY, BZ, CA, CH, CN, CO, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, DO, DZ, EC, EE, EG, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, GT, HN, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KM, KN, KP, KR, KZ, LA, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LY, MA, MD, ME, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, MY, MZ, NA, NG, NI, NO, NZ, OM, PG, PH, PL, PT, RO, RS, RU, SC, SD, SE, SG, SK, SL, SM, ST, SV, SY, TJ, TM, TN, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, US, UZ, VC, VN, ZA, ZM, ZW.

(84) Designated States *(unless otherwise indicated, for every kind of regional protection available)*: ARIPO (BW, GH, GM, KE, LS, MW, MZ, NA, SD, SL, SZ, TZ, UG, ZM, ZW), Eurasian (AM, AZ, BY, KG, KZ, MD, RU, TJ, TM), European (AT, BE, BG, CH, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, HR, HU, IE, IS, IT, LT, LU, LV, MC, MT, NL, NO, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, TR), OAPI (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA, GN, GQ, GW, ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG).

Declarations under Rule 4.17:

— *as to applicant's entitlement to apply for and be granted a patent (Rule 4.17(ii))*

— *as to the applicant's entitlement to claim the priority of the earlier application (Rule 4.17(iii))*

Published:

— *with international search report*

(54) Title: HIGH EFFICIENCY DISPOSABLE CELLULOSIC WIPER



FIG. 3B

(57) Abstract: A high efficiency disposable cellulosic wiper includes (a) pulp-derived papermaking fiber; (b) up to 75% by weight regenerated cellulosic microfiber having a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml, the microfiber being selected and present in amounts such that the wiper exhibits a Laplace pore volume fraction at pore sizes less than 15 microns of at least 1.5 times that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated cellulose microfiber. The wipers of the invention exhibit remarkable residue removal efficiency.

WO 2009/038735 A1

HIGH EFFICIENCY DISPOSABLE CELLULOSIC WIPER

Technical Field

The present invention relates to high efficiency wipers for cleaning surfaces such as eyeglasses, computer screens, appliances, windows and other substrates. In a preferred embodiment, the wipers contain fibrillated lyocell microfiber and provide substantially residue-free cleaning.

Background

Lyocell fibers are typically used in textiles or filter media. *See*, for example, United States Patent Application Publication Nos. US 2003/0177909 and US 2003/0168401 both to *Koslow*, as well as United States Patent No. 6,511,746 to *Collier et al.* On the other hand, high efficiency wipers for cleaning glass and other substrates are typically made from thermoplastic fibers.

United States Patent No. 6,890,649 to *Hobbs et al.* (3M) discloses polyester microfibers for use in a wiper product. According to the '649 patent the microfibers have an average effective diameter less than 20 microns and generally from 0.01 microns to 10 microns. *See* column 2, lines 38-40. These microfibers are prepared by fibrillating a film surface and then harvesting the fibers.

United States Patent No. 6,849,329 to *Perez et al.* discloses microfibers for use in cleaning wipes. These fibers are similar to those described in the '649 patent discussed above. United States Patent No. 6,645,618 also to *Hobbes et al.*

also discloses microfibers in fibrous mats such as those used for removal of oil from water or their use as wipers

United States Patent Publication No. US 2005/0148264 (Application No. 10/748,648) of *Varona et al.* discloses a wiper with a bimodal pore size distribution. The wipe is made from melt blown fibers as well as coarser fibers and papermaking fibers. *See* page 2, paragraph 16.

United States Patent Publication No. US 2004/0203306 (Application No. 10/833,229) of *Grafe et al.* discloses a flexible wipe including a non-woven layer and at least one adhered nanofiber layer. The nanofiber layer is illustrated in numerous photographs. It is noted on page 1, paragraph 9 that the microfibers have a fiber diameter of from about 0.05 microns to about 2 microns. In this patent, the nanofiber webs were evaluated for cleaning automotive dashboards, automotive windows and so forth. For example, *see* page 8, paragraphs 55, 56.

United States Patent No. 4,931,201 to *Julemont* discloses a non-woven wiper incorporating melt-blown fiber. United States Patent No. 4,906,513 to *Kebbell et al.* also discloses a wiper having melt-blown fiber. Here, polypropylene microfibers are used and the wipers are reported to provide streak-free wiping properties. This patent is of general interest as is United States Patent No. 4,436,780 to *Hotchkiss et al.* which discloses a wiper having a layer of melt-blown polypropylene fibers and on either side a spun bonded polypropylene filament layer. *See also* United States Patent No. 4,426,417 to *Meitner et al.* discloses a non-woven wiper having a matrix of non-woven fibers including microfiber and staple fiber. United States Patent No. 4,307,143 to *Meitner* discloses a low cost wiper for industrial applications which includes thermoplastic, melt-blown fibers.

United States Patent No. 4,100,324 to *Anderson et al.* discloses a non-woven fabric useful as a wiper which incorporates wood pulp fibers.

United States Patent Publication No. US 2006/0141881 (Application No. 11/361,875) of *Bergsten et al.* discloses a wipe with melt-blown fibers. This publication also describes a drag test at pages 7 and 9. *Note*, for example, page 7, paragraph 59. According to the test results on page 9, microfiber increases the drag of the wipe on a surface.

United States Patent Publication No. US 2003/0200991 (Application No. 10/135,903) of *Keck et al.* discloses a dual texture absorbent web. *Note* pages 12 and 13 which describe cleaning tests and a Gardner wet abrasion scrub test.

United States Patent No. 6,573,204 to *Philipp et al.* discloses a cleaning cloth having a non-woven structure made from micro staple fibers of at least two different polymers and secondary staple fibers bound into the micro staple fibers. The split fiber is reported to have a titer of 0.17 to 3.0 dtex prior to being split. *See* column 2, lines 7 through 9. *Note also,* United States Patent No. 6,624,100 to *Pike* which discloses splitable fiber for use in microfiber webs.

While there have been advances in the art as to high efficiency wipers, existing products tend to be relatively difficult and expensive to produce and are not readily re-pulped or recycled. Wipers of this invention are economically produced on conventional equipment such as a conventional wet press (CWP) papermachine and may be re-pulped and recycled with other paper products. Moreover, the wipers of the invention are capable of removing micro-particles and substantially all of the residue from a surface, reducing the need for biocides and cleaning solutions in typical cleaning or sanitizing operations.

Summary of Invention

There is provided in one aspect of the invention a high efficiency disposable cellulosic wiper incorporating pulp-derived papermaking fiber having a characteristic scattering coefficient of less than 50 m^2/kg; and up to 75% by weight or more fibrillated regenerated cellulosic microfiber having a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml, the microfiber being selected and present in amounts such that the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient of greater than 50 m^2/kg.

In another aspect there is provided a high efficiency disposable cellulosic wiper with pulp-derived papermaking fiber; and up to about 75% by weight fibrillated regenerated cellulosic microfiber having a characteristic CSF value less than 175 ml, the microfiber being further characterized in that 40% by weight thereof is finer than 14 mesh.

The fibrillated cellulose microfiber is present in amounts of 40 percent by weight and more based on the weight of fiber in the product in some cases; generally more than about 35 percent based on the weight of fiber in the sheet, for example. More than 37.5 percent and so forth may be employed as will be appreciated by one of skill in the art. In various products, sheets with more than 25%, more than 30% or more than 35%, 40 % or more by weight of any of the fibrillated cellulose microfiber specified herein may be used depending upon the intended properties desired. In some embodiments, the regenerated cellulose microfiber may be present from 10-75% as noted below; it being understood that the weight ranges described herein may be substituted in any embodiment of the invention sheet if so desired.

High efficiency wipers of the invention typically exhibit relative wicking ratios of 2-3 times that of comparable sheet without cellulose microfiber as well as Relative Bendtsen Smoothness of 1.5 to 5 times conventional sheet of a like

nature. In still further aspects of the invention, wiper efficiencies far exceed conventional cellulosic sheet and the pore size of the sheet has a large volume fraction of pore with a radius of 15 microns or less.

The invention is better appreciated by reference to Figures **1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A** and **4B**. **Figures 1A** and **1B** are SEM's of a creped sheet of pulp-derived papermaking fibers and fibrillated lyocell (25% by weight), air side, at 150X and 750X. **Figures 2A, 2B** are SEM's of the Yankee side of the sheet at like magnification. It is seen in **Figures 1A-2B** that the microfiber is of very high surface area and forms a microfiber network over the surface of the sheet.

Figures 3A, 3B are SEM's of a creped sheet of 50% lyocell microfiber, 50% pulp-derived papermaking fiber (air side) at 150X and 750X. **Figures 4A, 4B** are SEM's of the Yankee side of the sheet at like magnification. Here is seen that substantially all of the contact area of the sheet is fibrillated, regenerated cellulose of very small fiber diameter.

Without intending to be bound by theory, it is believed that the microfiber network is effective to remove substantially all of the residue from a surface under moderate pressure, whether the residue is hydrophilic or hydrophobic. This unique property provides for cleaning a surface with reduced amounts of cleaning solution, which can be expensive and may irritate the skin, for example. In addition, the removal of even microscopic residue will include removing microbes, reducing the need for biocides and/or increasing their effectiveness.

The inventive wipers are particularly effective for cleaning glass and appliances where even very small amounts of residue impairs clarity and destroys surface sheen.

Still further features and advantages will become apparent from the discussion which follows.

Brief Description of Drawings

The invention is described in detail below with reference to the **Figures** wherein:

Figures 1A and **1B** are SEM's of a creped sheet of pulp-derived papermaking fibers and fibrillated lyocell (25% by weight), air side at 150X and 750X;

Figures 2A, 2B are SEM's of the Yankee side of the sheet of **Figures 1A** and **1B** at like magnification;

Figures 3A, 3B are SEM's of a creped sheet of 50% lyocell microfiber, 50% pulp-derived papermaking fiber (air side) at 150X and 750X;

Figures 4A, 4B are SEM's of the Yankee side of the sheet of **Figures 3A** and **3B** at like magnification;

Figure 5 is a histogram showing fiber size or "fineness" of fibrillated lyocell fibers;

Figure 6 is a plot of FQA measured fiber length for various fibrillated lyocell fiber samples;

Figure 7 is a plot of scattering coefficient in m^2/kg versus % fibrillated lyocell microfiber for handsheets prepared with microfiber and papermaking fiber;

Figure 8 is a plot of breaking length for various products;

Figure 9 is a plot of relative bonded area in % versus breaking length for various products;

Figure 10 is a plot of wet breaking length versus dry breaking length for various products including handsheets made with fibrillated lyocell microfiber and pulp-derived papermaking fiber;

Figure 11 is a plot of TAPPI Opacity versus breaking length for various products;

Figure 12 is a plot of Formation Index versus TAPPI Opacity for various products;

Figure 13 is a plot of TAPPI Opacity versus breaking length for various products including lyocell microfiber and pulp-derived papermaking fiber;

Figure 14 is a plot of bulk, cc/g versus breaking length for various products with and without lyocell papermaking fiber;

Figure 15 is a plot of TAPPI Opacity versus breaking length for pulp-derived fiber handsheets and 50/50 lyocell/pulp handsheets;

Figure 16 is a plot of scattering coefficient versus breaking length for 100% lyocell handsheets and softwood fiber handsheets;

Figure 17 is a histogram illustrating the effect of strength resins on breaking length and wet/dry ratio;

Figure 18 is a schematic diagram of a wet-press paper machine which may be used in the practice of the present invention;

Figure 19 is a schematic diagram of an extrusion porosimetry apparatus;

Figure 20 is a plot of pore volume in percent versus pore radius in microns for various wipers;

Figure 21 is a plot of pore volume, $mm^3/(g^*$ microns);

Figure 22 is a plot of average pore radius in microns versus microfiber content for softwood Kraft basesheets;

Figure 23 is a plot of pore volume versus pore radius for wipers with and without cellulose microfiber.

Figure 24 is another plot of pore volume versus pore radius for handsheets with and without cellulose microfiber.

Figure 25 is a plot of cumulative pore volume versus pore radius for handsheets with and without cellulose microfiber;

Figure 26 is a plot of capillary pressure versus saturation for wipers with and without cellulose microfiber;

Figure 27 is a plot of average Bendtsen Roughness @ 1 kg, ml/min versus percent by weight cellulose microfiber in the sheet; and

Figure 28 is a histogram illustrating water and oil residue testing for wipers with and without cellulose microfiber.

Detailed Description

The invention is described in detail below with reference to several embodiments and numerous examples. Such discussion is for purposes of illustration only. Modifications to particular examples within the spirit and scope of the present invention, set forth in the appended claims, will be readily apparent to one of skill in the art.

Terminology used herein is given its ordinary meaning consistent with the exemplary definitions set forth immediately below; mils (25.4 micrometers) refers to thousandths of an inch (cm); mg refers to milligrams and m^2 refers to square meters, percent means weight percent (dry basis) , "ton" means short ton (2000 pounds) (907.2 kg), unless otherwise indicated "ream" means 3000 ft^2 (279 m^2), and so forth. Unless otherwise specified, the version of a test method applied is that in effect as of January 1, 2006 and test specimens are prepared under standard TAPPI conditions; that is, conditioned in an atmosphere of 23° ± 1.0°C (73.4° ± 1.8°F) at 50% relative humidity for at least about 2 hours.

Absorbency of the inventive products is measured with a simple absorbency tester. The simple absorbency tester is a particularly useful apparatus for measuring the hydrophilicity and absorbency properties of a sample of tissue, napkins, or towel. In this test a sample of tissue, napkins, or towel 2.0 inches (5.1 cm) in diameter is mounted between a top flat plastic cover and a bottom grooved sample plate. The tissue, napkin, or towel sample disc is held in place by a 1/8 inch (0.3 cm) wide circumference flange area. The sample is not compressed by the holder. De-ionized water at 73°F (23°C) is introduced to the sample at the center of the bottom sample plate through a 1 mm diameter conduit. This water is at a hydrostatic head of minus 5 mm. Flow is initiated by a pulse introduced at the start of the measurement by the instrument mechanism. Water is thus imbibed by the tissue, napkin, or towel sample from this central entrance point radially

outward by capillary action. When the rate of water imbibation decreases below 0.005 gm water per 5 seconds, the test is terminated. The amount of water removed from the reservoir and absorbed by the sample is weighed and reported as grams of water per square meter of sample or grams of water per gram of sheet. In practice, an M/K Systems Inc. Gravimetric Absorbency Testing System is used. This is a commercial system obtainable from M/K Systems Inc., 12 Garden Street, Danvers, Mass., 01923. WAC or water absorbent capacity, also referred to as SAT, is actually determined by the instrument itself. WAC is defined as the point where the weight versus time graph has a "zero" slope, i.e., the sample has stopped absorbing. The termination criteria for a test are expressed in maximum change in water weight absorbed over a fixed time period. This is basically an estimate of zero slope on the weight versus time graph. The program uses a change of 0.005g over a 5 second time interval as termination criteria; unless "Slow SAT" is specified in which case the cut off criteria is 1 mg in 20 seconds.

The void volume and /or void volume ratio as referred to hereafter, are determined by saturating a sheet with a nonpolar POROFIL ® liquid and measuring the amount of liquid absorbed. The volume of liquid absorbed is equivalent to the void volume within the sheet structure. The percent weight increase (PWI) is expressed as grams of liquid absorbed per gram of fiber in the sheet structure times 100, as noted hereinafter. More specifically, for each single-ply sheet sample to be tested, select 8 sheets and cut out a 1 inch by 1 inch (2.54 cm by 2.54 cm) square (1 inch in the machine direction and 1 inch in the cross-machine direction). For multi-ply product samples, each ply is measured as a separate entity. Multiple samples should be separated into individual single plies and 8 sheets from each ply position used for testing. To measure absorbency, weigh and record the dry weight of each test specimen to the nearest 0.0001 gram. Place the specimen in a dish containing POROFIL ® liquid having a specific gravity of about 1.93 grams per cubic centimeter, available from Coulter Electronics Ltd., Northwell Drive, Luton, Beds, England; Part No. 9902458.)

After 10 seconds, grasp the specimen at the very edge (1-2 Millimeters in) of one corner with tweezers and remove from the liquid. Hold the specimen with that corner uppermost and allow excess liquid to drip for 30 seconds. Lightly dab (less than ½ second contact) the lower corner of the specimen on #4 filter paper (Whatman Lt., Maidstone, England) in order to remove any excess of the last partial drop. Immediately weigh the specimen, within 10 seconds, recording the weight to the nearest 0.0001 gram. The PWI for each specimen, expressed as grams of POROFIL ® liquid per gram of fiber, is calculated as follows:

$$PWI = [(W_2-W_1)/W_1] \text{ X } 100\%$$

wherein

"W_1" is the dry weight of the specimen, in grams; and

"W_2" is the wet weight of the specimen, in grams.

The PWI for all eight individual specimens is determined as described above and the average of the eight specimens is the PWI for the sample.

The void volume ratio is calculated by dividing the PWI by 1.9 (density of fluid) to express the ratio as a percentage, whereas the void volume (gms/gm) is simply the weight increase ratio; that is, PWI divided by 100.

Unless otherwise specified, "basis weight", BWT, bwt and so forth refers to the weight of a 3000 square foot (278.7 square meters) ream of product. Consistency refers to percent solids of a nascent web, for example, calculated on a bone dry basis. "Air dry" means including residual moisture, by convention up to about 10 percent moisture for pulp and up to about 6% for paper. A nascent web having 50 percent water and 50 percent bone dry pulp has a consistency of 50 percent.

Bendtsen Roughness is determined in accordance with ISO Test Method 8791-2. Relative Bendtsen Smoothness is the ratio of the Bendtsen Roughness value of a sheet without cellulose microfiber to the Bendtsen Roughness value of a like sheet where cellulose microfiber has been added.

The term "cellulosic", "cellulosic sheet" and the like is meant to include any product incorporating papermaking fiber having cellulose as a major constituent. "Papermaking fibers" include virgin pulps or recycle (secondary) cellulosic fibers or fiber mixes comprising cellulosic fibers. Fibers suitable for making the webs of this invention include: nonwood fibers, such as cotton fibers or cotton derivatives, abaca, kenaf, sabai grass, flax, esparto grass, straw, jute hemp, bagasse, milkweed floss fibers, and pineapple leaf fibers; and wood fibers such as those obtained from deciduous and coniferous trees, including softwood fibers, such as northern and southern softwood Kraft fibers; hardwood fibers, such as eucalyptus, maple, birch, aspen, or the like. Papermaking fibers used in connection with the invention are typically naturally occurring pulp-derived fibers (as opposed to reconstituted fibers such as lyocell or rayon) which are liberated from their source material by any one of a number of pulping processes familiar to one experienced in the art including sulfate, sulfite, polysulfide, soda pulping, etc. The pulp can be bleached if desired by chemical means including the use of chlorine, chlorine dioxide, oxygen, alkaline peroxide and so forth. Naturally occurring pulp-derived fibers are referred to herein simply as "pulp-derived" papermaking fibers. The products of the present invention may comprise a blend of conventional fibers (whether derived from virgin pulp or recycle sources) and high coarseness lignin-rich tubular fibers, such as bleached chemical thermomechanical pulp (BCTMP). Pulp-derived fibers thus also include high yield fibers such as BCTMP as well as thermomechanical pulp (TMP), chemithermomechanical pulp (CTMP) and alkaline peroxide mechanical pulp (APMP). "Furnishes" and like terminology refers to aqueous compositions

including papermaking fibers, optionally wet strength resins, debonders and the like for making paper products. For purposes of calculating relative percentages of papermaking fibers, the fibrillated lyocell content is excluded as noted below.

Formation index is a measure of uniformity or formation of tissue or towel. Formation indices reported herein are on the Robotest scale wherein the index ranges from 20-120, with 120 corresponding to a perfectly homogenous mass distribution. *See* Waterhouse, J.F., On-Line Formation Measurements and Paper Quality, IPST technical paper series 604, Institute of Paper Science and Technology (1996).

Kraft softwood fiber is low yield fiber made by the well known Kraft (sulfate) pulping process from coniferous material and includes northern and southern softwood Kraft fiber, Douglas fir Kraft fiber and so forth. Kraft softwood fibers generally have a lignin content of less than 5 percent by weight, a length weighted average fiber length of greater than 2 mm, as well as an arithmetic average fiber length of greater than 0.6 mm.

Kraft hardwood fiber is made by the Kraft process from hardwood sources, i.e., eucalyptus and also has generally a lignin content of less than 5 percent by weight. Kraft hardwood fibers are shorter than softwood fibers, typically having a length weighted average fiber length of less than 1.2 mm and an arithmetic average length of less than 0.5 mm or less than 0.4 mm.

Recycle fiber may be added to the furnish in any amount. While any suitable recycle fiber may be used, recycle fiber with relatively low levels of groundwood is preferred in many cases, for example recycle fiber with less than 15% by weight lignin content, or less than 10% by weight lignin content may be preferred depending on the furnish mixture employed and the application.

Tissue calipers and or bulk reported herein may be measured at 8 or 16 sheet calipers as specified. Hand sheet caliper and bulk is based on 5 sheets. The sheets are stacked and the caliper measurement taken about the central portion of the stack. Preferably, the test samples are conditioned in an atmosphere of 23° ± 1.0°C (73.4° ± 1.8°F) at 50% relative humidity for at least about 2 hours and then measured with a Thwing-Albert Model 89-II-JR or Progage Electronic Thickness Tester with 2-in (50.8 mm) diameter anvils, 539 ± 10 grams dead weight load, and 0.231 in./sec (0.587 cm/sec) descent rate. For finished product testing, each sheet of product to be tested must have the same number of plies as the product when sold. For testing in general, eight sheets are selected and stacked together. For napkin testing, napkins are unfolded prior to stacking. For base sheet testing off of winders, each sheet to be tested must have the same number of plies as produced off the winder. For base sheet testing off of the papermachine reel, single plies must be used. Sheets are stacked together aligned in the MD. On custom embossed or printed product, try to avoid taking measurements in these areas if at all possible. Bulk may also be expressed in units of volume/weight by dividing caliper by basis weight (specific bulk).

The term compactively dewatering the web or furnish refers to mechanical dewatering by wet pressing on a dewatering felt, for example, in some embodiments by use of mechanical pressure applied continuously over the web surface as in a nip between a press roll and a press shoe wherein the web is in contact with a papermaking felt. The terminology "compactively dewatering" is used to distinguish processes wherein the initial dewatering of the web is carried out largely by thermal means as is the case, for example, in United States Patent No. 4,529,480 to *Trokhan* and United States Patent No. 5,607,551 to *Farrington et al.*. Compactively dewatering a web thus refers, for example, to removing water from a nascent web having a consistency of less than 30 percent or so by application of pressure thereto and/or increasing the consistency of the web by about 15 percent or more by application of pressure thereto.

Crepe can be expressed as a percentage calculated as:

Crepe percent = [1-reel speed/Yankee speed] x 100%

A web creped from a drying cylinder with a surface speed of 100 fpm (feet per minute) (0.508 m/s) to a reel with a velocity of 80 fpm (0.41 m/s) has a reel crepe of 20%.

A creping adhesive used to secure the web to the Yankee drying cylinder is preferably a hygroscopic, re-wettable, substantially non-crosslinking adhesive. Examples of preferred adhesives are those which include poly(vinyl alcohol) of the general class described in United States Patent No. 4,528,316 to *Soerens et al.* Other suitable adhesives are disclosed in co-pending United States Patent Application Serial No. 10/409,042 (United States Publication No. US 2005-0006040 A1), filed April 9, 2003, entitled "Improved Creping Adhesive Modifier and Process for Producing Paper Products" (Attorney Docket No. 2394). Suitable adhesives are optionally provided with modifiers and so forth. It is preferred to use crosslinker and/or modifier sparingly or not at all in the adhesive.

"Debonder", debonder composition", "softener" and like terminology refers to compositions used for decreasing tensiles or softening absorbent paper products. Typically, these compositions include surfactants as an active ingredient and are further discussed below.

"Freeness" or CSF is determined in accordance with TAPPI Standard T 227 OM-94 (Canadian Standard Method). Any suitable method of preparing the regenerated cellulose microfiber for freeness testing may be employed, so long as

the fiber is well dispersed. For example, if the fiber is pulped at 5% consistency for a few minutes or more, i.e. 5-20 minutes before testing, the fiber is well dispersed for testing. Likewise, partially dried fibrillated regenerated cellulose microfiber can be treated for 5 minutes in a British disintegrator at 1.2% consistency to ensure proper dispersion of the fibers. All preparation and testing is done at room temperature and either distilled or deionized water is used throughout.

A like sheet prepared without regenerated cellulose microfiber and like terminology refers to a sheet made by substantially the same process having substantially the same composition as a sheet made with regenerated cellulose microfiber except that the furnish includes no regenerated cellulose microfiber and substitutes papermaking fiber having substantially the same composition as the other papermaking fiber in the sheet. Thus, with respect to a sheet having 60% by weight northern softwood fiber, 20% by weight northern hardwood fiber and 20% by weight regenerated cellulose microfiber made by a CWP process, a like sheet without regenerated cellulose microfiber is made by the same CWP process with 75% by weight northern softwood fiber and 25% by weight northern hardwood fiber. Similarly, "a like sheet prepared with cellulose microfiber" refers to a sheet made by substantially the same process having substantially the same composition as a fibrous sheet made without cellulose microfiber except that other fibers are proportionately replaced with cellulose microfiber.

Lyocell fibers are solvent spun cellulose fibers produced by extruding a solution of cellulose into a coagulating bath. Lyocell fiber is to be distinguished from cellulose fiber made by other known processes, which rely on the formation of a soluble chemical derivative of cellulose and its subsequent decomposition to regenerate the cellulose, for example, the viscose process. Lyocell is a generic term for fibers spun directly from a solution of cellulose in an amine containing medium, typically a tertiary amine N-oxide. The production of lyocell fibers is the

subject matter of many patents. Examples of solvent-spinning processes for the production of lyocell fibers are described in: United States Patent No. 6,235,392 of *Luo et al.*; United States Patent Nos. 6,042,769 and 5,725,821 to *Gannon et al.*

"MD" means machine direction and "CD" means cross-machine direction.

Opacity or TAPPI opacity is measured according to TAPPI test procedure T425-OM-91, or equivalent.

Effective pore radius is defined by the Laplace Equation discussed herein and is suitably measured by intrusion and/or extrusion porosimetry. The relative wicking ratio of a sheet refers to the ratio of the average effective pore diameter of a sheet made without cellulose microfiber to the average effective pore diameter of a sheet made with cellulose microfiber.

"Predominant" and like terminology means more than 50% by weight. The fibrillated lyocell content of a sheet is calculated based on the total fiber weight in the sheet; whereas the relative amount of other papermaking fibers is calculated exclusive of fibrillated lyocell content. Thus a sheet that is 20% fibrillated lyocell, 35% by weight softwood fiber and 45% by weight hardwood fiber has hardwood fiber as the predominant papermaking fiber inasmuch as 45/80 of the papermaking fiber (exclusive of fibrillated lyocell) is hardwood fiber.

"Scattering coefficient" sometimes abbreviated "S", is determined in accordance with TAPPI test method T-425 om-01. This method functions at an effective wavelength of 572 nm. Scattering coefficient (m^2/kg herein) is the normalized value of scattering power to account for basis weight of the sheet.

Characteristic scattering coefficient of a pulp refers to the scattering coefficient of a standard sheet made from 100% of that pulp, excluding components which substantially alter the scattering characteristics of neat pulp such as fillers and the like.

"Relative bonded area" or "RBA" = $(S_0-S)/S_0$ where S_0 is the scattering coefficient of the unbonded sheet, obtained from an extrapolation of S versus Tensile to zero tensile. *See* Ingmanson W.L. and Thode E.F., TAPPI 42(1):83(1959).

Dry tensile strengths (MD and CD), stretch, ratios thereof, modulus, break modulus, stress and strain are measured with a standard Instron test device or other suitable elongation tensile tester which may be configured in various ways, typically using 3 or 1 inch or 15 mm wide strips of tissue or towel, conditioned in an atmosphere of 23° ± 1°C (73.4° ± 1°F) at 50% relative humidity for 2 hours. The tensile test is run at a crosshead speed of 2 in/min (0.08 cm/s). Tensile strength is sometimes referred to simply as "tensile" and is reported in g/3" (g/7.62 cm)or g/in (g/cm). Tensile may also be reported as breaking length (km).

Tensile ratios are simply ratios of the values determined by way of the foregoing methods. Unless otherwise specified, a tensile property is a dry sheet property.

The wet tensile of the tissue of the present invention is measured using a three-inch wide strip of tissue that is folded into a loop, clamped in a special fixture termed a Finch Cup, then immersed in a water. The Finch Cup, which is available from the Thwing-Albert Instrument Company of Philadelphia, Pa., is mounted onto a tensile tester equipped with a 2.0 pound (0.9 kg) load cell with the flange of the Finch Cup clamped by the tester's lower jaw and the ends of tissue loop clamped into the upper jaw of the tensile tester. The sample is immersed in

water that has been adjusted to a pH of 7.0 ± 0.1 and the tensile is tested after a 5 second immersion time. Values are divided by two, as appropriate, to account for the loop.

Wet/dry tensile ratios are expressed in percent by multiplying the ratio by 100. For towel products, the wet/dry CD tensile ratio is the most relevant. Throughout this specification and claims which follow "wet/dry ratio" or like terminology refers to the wet/dry CD tensile ratio unless clearly specified otherwise. For handsheets, MD and CD values are approximately equivalent.

Debonder compositions are typically comprised of cationic or anionic amphiphilic compounds, or mixtures thereof (hereafter referred to as surfactants) combined with other diluents and non-ionic amphiphilic compounds; where the typical content of surfactant in the debonder composition ranges from about 10 wt% to about 90 wt%. Diluents include propylene glycol, ethanol, propanol, water, polyethylene glycols, and nonionic amphiphilic compounds. Diluents are often added to the surfactant package to render the latter more tractable (i.e., lower viscosity and melting point). Some diluents are artifacts of the surfactant package synthesis (e.g., propylene glycol). Non-ionic amphiphilic compounds, in addition to controlling composition properties, can be added to enhance the wettability of the debonder, where both debonding and maintenance of absorbency properties are critical to the substrate that a debonder is applied. The nonionic amphiphilic compounds can be added to debonder compositions to disperse inherent water immiscible surfactant packages in water streams, such as encountered during papermaking. Alternatively, the nonionic amphiphilic compound, or mixtures of different non-ionic amphiphilic compounds, as indicated in United States Patent No. 6,969,443 to *Kokko*, can be carefully selected to predictably adjust the debonding properties of the final debonder composition.

Quaternary ammonium compounds, such as dialkyl dimethyl quaternary ammonium salts are suitable particularly when the alkyl groups contain from about 10 to 24 carbon atoms. These compounds have the advantage of being relatively insensitive to pH.

Biodegradable softeners can be utilized. Representative biodegradable cationic softeners/debonders are disclosed in United States Patent Nos. 5,312,522; 5,415,737; 5,262,007; 5,264,082; and 5,223,096. The compounds are biodegradable diesters of quaternary ammonia compounds, quaternized amine-esters, and biodegradable vegetable oil based esters functional with quaternary ammonium chloride and diester dierucyldimethyl ammonium chloride and are representative biodegradable softeners.

After debonder treatment, the pulp may be mixed with strength adjusting agents such as permanent wet strength agents (WSR), optionally dry strength agents and so forth before the sheet is formed. Suitable permanent wet strength agents are known to the skilled artisan. A comprehensive but non-exhaustive list of useful strength aids include urea-formaldehyde resins, melamine formaldehyde resins, glyoxylated polyacrylamide resins, polyamidamine-epihalohydrin resins and the like. Thermosetting polyacrylamides are produced by reacting acrylamide with diallyl dimethyl ammonium chloride (DADMAC) to produce a cationic polyacrylamide copolymer which is ultimately reacted with glyoxal to produce a cationic cross-linking wet strength resin, glyoxylated polyacrylamide. These materials are generally described in United States Patent Nos. 3,556,932 to *Coscia et al.* and 3,556,933 to *Williams et al.*. Resins of this type are commercially available under the trade name of PAREZ. Different mole ratios of acrylamide/-DADMAC/glyoxal can be used to produce cross-linking resins, which are useful as wet strength agents. Furthermore, other dialdehydes can be substituted for glyoxal to produce thermosetting wet strength characteristics. Of particular utility as WSR are the polyamidamine-epihalohydrin permanent wet strength resins, an

example of which is sold under the trade names Kymene 557LX and Kymene 557H by Hercules Incorporated of Wilmington, Delaware and Amres® from Georgia-Pacific Resins, Inc. These resins and the process for making the resins are described in United States Patent No. 3,700,623 and United States Patent No. 3,772,076. An extensive description of polymeric-epihalohydrin resins is given in Chapter 2: Alkaline-Curing Polymeric Amine-Epichlorohydrin by Espy in *Wet Strength Resins and Their Application* (L. Chan, Editor, 1994). A reasonably comprehensive list of wet strength resins is described by Westfelt in *Cellulose Chemistry and Technology* Volume 13, p. 813, 1979.

Suitable dry strength agents include starch, guar gum, polyacrylamides, carboxymethyl cellulose (CMC) and the like. Of particular utility is carboxymethyl cellulose, an example of which is sold under the trade name Hercules CMC, by Hercules Incorporated of Wilmington, Delaware.

In accordance with the invention, regenerated cellulose fiber is prepared from a cellulosic dope comprising cellulose dissolved in a solvent comprising tertiary amine N-oxides or ionic liquids. The solvent composition for dissolving cellulose and preparing underivatized cellulose dopes suitably includes tertiary amine oxides such as N-methylmorpholine-N-oxide (NMMO) and similar compounds enumerated in United States Patent No. 4,246,221 to *McCorsley*. Cellulose dopes may contain non-solvents for cellulose such as water, alkanols or other solvents as will be appreciated from the discussion which follows.

Suitable cellulosic dopes are enumerated in Table 1, below.

Table 1

EXAMPLES OF TERTIARY AMINE N-OXIDE SOLVENTS		
Tertiary Amine N-oxide	% water	% cellulose
N-methylmorpholine N-oxide	up to 22	up to 38
N,N-dimethyl-ethanol-amine N-oxide	up to 12.5	up to 31
N,N-dimethylcyclohexylamine N-oxide	up to 21	up to 44
N-methylhomopiperidine N-oxide	5.5-20	1-22
N,N,N-triethylamine N-oxide	7-29	5-15
2(2-hydroxypropoxy)-N-ethyl-N,N,-dimethyl-amide N-oxide	5-10	2-7.5
N-methylpiperidine N-oxide	up to 17.5	5-17.5
N,N-dimethylbenzylamine N-oxide	5.5-17	1-20

See, also, United States Patent No., 3,508,945 to *Johnson*.

Details with respect to preparation of cellulosic dopes including cellulose dissolved in suitable ionic liquids and cellulose regeneration therefrom are found in United States Patent Application No. 10/256,521 (Publication No. US 2003/0157351) of *Swatloski et al.* entitled "Dissolution and Processing of Cellulose Using Ionic Liquids". Here again, suitable levels of non-solvents for cellulose may be included. There is described generally in this patent application a process for dissolving cellulose in an ionic liquid without derivatization and regenerating the cellulose in a range of structural forms. It is reported that the cellulose solubility and the solution properties can be controlled by the selection of ionic liquid constituents with small cations and halide or pseudohalide anions

favoring solution. Preferred ionic liquids for dissolving cellulose include those with cyclic cations such as the following cations: imidazolium; pyridinum; pyridazinium; pyrimidinium; pyrazinium; pyrazolium; oxazolium; 1,2,3-triazolium; 1,2,4-triazolium; thiazolium; piperidinium; pyrrolidinium; quinolinium; and isoquinolinium.

Processing techniques for ionic liquids/cellulose dopes are also discussed in United States Patent No. 6,808,557 to *Holbrey et al.*, entitled "Cellulose Matrix Encapsulation and Method". *Note also*, United States Patent Application No. 11/087,496 (Publication No. US 2005/0288484) of *Holbrey et al.*, entitled "Polymer Dissolution and Blend Formation in Ionic Liquids", as well as United States Patent Application No. 10/394,989 (Publication No. US 2004/0038031) of *Holbrey et al.,* entitled "Cellulose Matrix Encapsulation and Method". With respect to ionic fluids in general the following documents provide further detail: United States Patent Application No. 11/406,620 (Publication No. US 2006/0241287) of *Hecht et al.*, entitled "Extracting Biopolymers From a Biomass Using Ionic Liquids"; United States Patent Application No. 11/472,724 (Publication No. US 2006/0240727) of *Price et al.*, entitled "Ionic Liquid Based Products and Method of Using The Same"; United States Patent Application No. 11/472,729 (Publication No. US 2006/0240728) of *Price et al.*, entitled "Ionic Liquid Based Products and Method of Using the Same"; United States Patent Application No. 11/263,391 (Publication No. US 2006/0090271) of *Price et al.*, entitled "Processes For Modifying Textiles Using Ionic Liquids"; and United States Patent Application No. 11/375,963 (Publication No. 2006/0207722) of *Amano et al.* Some ionic liquids and quasi-ionic liquids which may be suitable are disclosed by *Konig et al.*, Chem. Commun. 2005, 1170-1172.

"Ionic liquid", refers to a molten composition including an ionic compound that is preferably a stable liquid at temperatures of less than 100°C at ambient pressure. Typically, such liquids have very low vapor pressure at 100°C,

less than 75 mBar (7.5 kPa) or so and preferably less than 50 mBar (5 kPa) or less than 25 mBar (2.5 kPa) at 100°C. Most suitable liquids will have a vapor pressure of less than 10 mBar (1 kPa) at 100°C and often the vapor pressure is so low it is negligible and is not easily measurable since it is less than 1 mBar (0.1 kPa) at 100°C.

Suitable commercially available ionic liquids are Basionic™ ionic liquid products available from BASF (Florham Park, NJ) and are listed in Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Exemplary Ionic Liquids

STANDARD

IL Abbreviation	**Basionic™ Grade**	**Product name**	**CAS Number**
EMIM Cl	ST 80	1-Ethyl-3-methylimidazolium chloride	65039-09-0
EMIM CH_3SO_3	ST 35	1-Ethyl-3-methylimidazolium methanesulfonate	145022-45-3
BMIM Cl	ST 70	1-Butyl-3-methylimidazolium chloride	79917-90-1
BMIM CH_3SO_3	ST 78	1-Butyl-3-methylimidazolium methanesulfonate	342789-81-5
MTBS	ST 62	Methyl-tri-n-butylammonium methylsulfate	13106-24-6
MMMPZ $MeOSO_3$	ST 33	1,2,4-Trimethylpyrazolium methylsulfate	
EMMIM $EtOSO_3$	ST 67	1-Ethyl-2,3-di-methylimidazolium ethylsulfate	516474-08-01
MMMIM $MeOSO_3$	ST 99	1,2,3-Trimethyl-imidazolium methylsulfate	65086-12-6

Table 2 – Exemplary Ionic Liquids (cont'd)

ACIDIC

IL Abbreviation	**Basionic™ Grade**	**Product name**	**CAS Number**
HMIM Cl	AC 75	Methylimidazolium chloride	35487-17-3
HMIM HSO_4	AC 39	Methylimidazolium hydrogensulfate	681281-87-8
EMIM HSO_4	AC 25	1-Ethyl-3-methylimidazolium hydrogensulfate	412009-61-1
EMIM $AlCl_4$	AC 09	1-Ethyl-3- methylimidazolium tetrachloroaluminate	80432-05-9
BMIM $HSO_{4</}$	AC 28	1-Butyl-3-methylimidazolium hydrogensulfate	262297-13-2
BMIM $AlCl_4$	AC 01	1-Butyl-3-methylimidazolium tetrachloroaluminate	80432-09-3

BASIC

IL Abbreviation	**Basionic™ Grade**	**Product name**	**CAS Number**
EMIM Acetat	BC 01	1-Ethyl-3-methylimidazolium acetate	143314-17-4
BMIM Acetat	BC 02	1-Butyl-3-methylimidazolium acetate	284049-75-8

LIQUID AT RT

IL Abbreviation	**Basionic™ Grade**	**Product name**	**CAS Number**
EMIM $EtOSO_3$	LQ 01	1-Ethyl-3- methylimidazolium ethylsulfate	342573-75-5
BMIM $MeOSO_3$	LQ 02	1-Butyl-3-methylimidazolium methylsulfate	401788-98-5

LOW VISCOSITY

IL Abbreviation	**Basionic™ Grade**	**Product name**	**CAS Number**
EMIM SCN	VS 01	1-Ethyl-3-methylimidazolium thiocyanate	331717-63-6
BMIM SCN	VS 02	1-Butyl-3-methylimidazolium thiocyanate	344790-87-0

Table 2 – Exemplary Ionic Liquids (cont'd)

FUNCTIONALIZED

IL Abbreviation	Basionic™ Grade	Product name	CAS Number
COL Acetate	FS 85	Choline acetate	14586-35-7
COL Salicylate	FS 65	Choline salicylate	2016-36-6
MTEOA $MeOSO_3$	FS 01	Tris-(2-hydroxyethyl)-methylammonium methylsulfate	29463-06-7

Cellulose dopes including ionic liquids having dissolved therein about 5% by weight underivatized cellulose are commercially available from Aldrich. These compositions utilize alkyl-methylimidazolium acetate as the solvent. It has been found that choline-based ionic liquids are not particularly suitable for dissolving cellulose.

After the cellulosic dope is prepared, it is spun into fiber, fibrillated and incorporated into absorbent sheet as hereinafter described.

A synthetic cellulose such as lyocell is split into micro- and nano-fibers and added to conventional wood pulp at a relatively low level, on the order of 10%. The fiber may be fibrillated in an unloaded disk refiner, for example, or any other suitable technique including using a PFI mil. Preferably, relatively short fiber is used and the consistency kept low during fibrillation. The beneficial features of fibrillated lyocell include: biodegradability, hydrogen bonding, dispersibility, repulpability, and smaller microfibers than obtainable with meltspun fibers, for example.

Fibrillated lyocell or its equivalent has advantages over splittable meltspun fibers. Synthetic microdenier fibers come in a variety of forms. For example, a 3 denier nylon/PET fiber in a so-called pie wedge configuration can be split into 16 or 32 segments, typically in a hydroentangling process. Each segment of a 16-

segment fiber would have a coarseness of about 2 mg/100m versus eucalyptus pulp at about 7 mg/100m. Unfortunately, a number of deficiencies have been identified with this approach for conventional wet laid applications. Dispersibility is less than optimal. Melt spun fibers must be split before sheet formation, and an efficient method is lacking. Most available polymers for these fibers are not biodegradable. The coarseness is lower than wood pulp, but still high enough that they must be used in substantial amounts and form a costly part of the furnish. Finally, the lack of hydrogen bonding requires other methods of retaining the fibers in the sheet.

Fibrillated lyocell has fibrils that can be as small as 0.1 – 0.25 microns (μm) in diameter, translating to a coarseness of 0.0013 – 0.0079 mg/100m. Assuming these fibrils are available as individual strands -- separate from the parent fiber – the furnish fiber population can be dramatically increased at a very low addition rate. Even fibrils not separated from the parent fiber may provide benefit. Dispersibility, repulpability, hydrogen bonding, and biodegradability remain product attributes since the fibrils are cellulose.

Fibrils from lyocell fiber have important distinctions from wood pulp fibrils. The most important distinction is the length of the lyocell fibrils. Wood pulp fibrils are only perhaps microns long, and therefore act in the immediate area of a fiber-fiber bond. Wood pulp fibrillation from refining leads to stronger, denser sheets. Lyocell fibrils, however, are potentially as long as the parent fibers. These fibrils can act as independent fibers and improve the bulk while maintaining or improving strength. Southern pine and mixed southern hardwood (MSHW) are two examples of fibers that are disadvantaged relative to premium pulps with respect to softness. The term "premium pulps" used herein refers to northern softwoods and eucalyptus pulps commonly used in the tissue industry for producing the softest bath, facial, and towel grades. Southern pine is coarser than northern softwood Kraft, and mixed southern hardwood is both coarser and higher

in fines than market eucalyptus. The lower coarseness and lower fines content of premium market pulp leads to a higher fiber population, expressed as fibers per gram (N or $N_{i>0.2}$) in Table 1. The coarseness and length values in Table 1 were obtained with an OpTest Fiber Quality Analyzer. Definitions are as follows:

$$L_n = \frac{\sum_{\text{all fibers}} n_i L_i}{\sum_{\text{all fibers}} n_i} \qquad L_{n,i>0.2} = \frac{\sum_{\text{i>0.2}} n_i L_i}{\sum_{\text{i>0.2}} n_i} \qquad C = 10^5 \times \frac{sampleweight}{\sum_{\text{all fibers}} n_i L_i}$$

$$N = \frac{100}{CL} [=] \; millionfibers / gram$$

Northern bleached softwood Kraft (NBSK) and eucalyptus have more fibers per gram than southern pine and hardwood. Lower coarseness leads to higher fiber populations and smoother sheets.

Table 3 – Fiber Properties

Sample	Type	C, mg/100m	Fines, %	$L_{n,\ mm}$	N, MM/g	$L_{n,\ i>0.2,\ mm}$	$N_{i>0.2}$, MM/g
Southern HW	Pulp	10.1	21	0.28	35	0.91	11
Southern HW - low fines	Pulp	10.1	7	0.54	18	0.94	11
Aracruz Eucalyptus	Pulp	6.9	5	0.50	29	0.72	20
Southern SW	Pulp	18.7	9	0.60	9	1.57	3
Northern SW	Pulp	14.2	3	1.24	6	1.74	4
Southern (30 SW/70 HW)	Base sheet	11.0	18	0.31	29	0.93	10
30 Southern SW/70 Eucalyptus	Base sheet	8.3	7	0.47	26	0.77	16

For comparison, the "parent" or "stock" fibers of unfibrillated lyocell have a coarseness 16.6 mg/100m before fibrillation and a diameter of about 11-12 μm.

The fibrils of fibrillated lyocell have a coarseness on the order of 0.001 – 0.008 mg/100m. Thus, the fiber population can be dramatically increased at relatively low addition rates. Fiber length of the parent fiber is selectable, and fiber length of the fibrils can depend on the starting length and the degree of cutting during the fibrillation process, as can be seen in **Figures 5 and 6**.

The dimensions of the fibers passing the 200 mesh screen are on the order of 0.2 micron by 100 micron long. Using these dimensions, one calculates a fiber population of 200 billion fibers per gram. For perspective, southern pine might be three million fibers per gram and eucalyptus might be twenty million fibers per gram (Table 1). It appears that these fibers are the fibrils that are broken away from the original unrefined fibers. Different fiber shapes with lyocell intended to readily fibrillate could result in 0.2 micron diameter fibers that are perhaps 1000 microns or more long instead of 100. As noted above, fibrillated fibers of regenerated cellulose may be made by producing "stock" fibers having a diameter of 10-12 microns or so followed by fibrillating the parent fibers. Alternatively, fibrillated lyocell microfibers have recently become available from Engineered Fibers Technology (Shelton, Connecticut) having suitable properties. There is shown in **Figure 5** a series of Bauer-McNett classifier analyses of fibrillated lyocell samples showing various degrees of "fineness". Particularly preferred materials are more than 40% fiber that is finer than 14 mesh and exhibit a very low coarseness (low freeness). For ready reference, mesh sizes appear in Table 4, below.

Table 4 – Mesh Size

Sieve Mesh #	Inches	Microns
14	.0555	1400
28	.028	700
60	.0098	250
100	.0059	150
200	.0029	74

Details as to fractionation using the Bauer-McNett Classifier appear in *Gooding et al.*, "Fractionation in a Bauer-McNett Classifier", Journal of Pulp and Paper

Science; Vol. 27, No. 12, December 2001.

Figure 6 is a plot showing fiber length as measured by an FQA analyzer for various samples including samples 17-20 shown on **Figure 5**. From this data it is appreciated that much of the fine fiber is excluded by the FQA analyzed and length prior to fibrillation has an effect on fineness.

The following abbreviations and tradenames are used in the examples which follow:

Abbreviations and Tradenames

Amres – wet strength resin trademark;
BCTMP – bleached chemi-mechanical pulp
cmf – regenerated cellulose microfiber;
CMC – carboxymethyl cellulose;
CWP – conventional wet-press process, including felt-pressing to a drying cylinder;
DB – debonder;
NBSK – northern bleached softwood Kraft;
NSK – northern softwood Kraft;
RBA – relative bonded area;
REV – refers to refining in a PFI mill, # of revolutions;
SBSK – southern bleached softwood Kraft;
SSK – southern softwood Kraft;
Varisoft – Trademark for debonder;
W/D – wet/dry CD tensile ratio; and
WSR – wet strength resin.

30

Examples 1-22

Utilizing pulp-derived papermaking fiber and fibrillated lyocell, including the Sample 17 material noted above, handsheets (16 lb/ream (6.8 kg/ream or 26 gsm) nominal) were prepared from furnish at 3% consistency. The sheets were wet-pressed at 15 psi (100 kPa) for 5-½ minutes prior to drying. Sheet was produced with and without wet and dry strength resins and debonders as indicated in Table 5 which provides details as to composition and properties.

Table 5 – 16 lb. (6.8 kg) Sheet Data

Run#	Description	cmf	refining	cmf source	Formation Index	Tensile g/3 in (g/cm)	Stretch %
1-1	0 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	0	0		95	5988 (785.8)	4.2
2-1	1000 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	0	1000		101	11915 (1563.7)	4.2
3-1	2500 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	0	2500		102	14354 (1883.7)	4.7
4-1	6000 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	0	6000		102	16086 (2111.0)	4.8
5-1	0 rev, 90% pulp/10% cnf tank 3, no chemical	10	0	refined 6 mm	95	6463 (848.2)	4.1
6-1	1000 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf tank 3, no chemical	10	1000	refined 6 mm	99	10698 (1403.9)	4.5
7-1	1000 rev, 80% pulp/20% cmf tank 3, no chemical	20	1000	refined 6 mm	96	9230 (1211)	4.2
8-1	2500 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf tank 3, no chemical	10	2500	refined 6 mm	100	12292 (1613.1)	5.4
9-1	6000 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf, no chemical	10	6000	refined 6 mm	99	15249 (2001.1)	5.0
10-1	0 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	10	0	cmf	99	7171 (941.1)	4.7
11-1	1000 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	10	1000	cmf	99	10767 (1413.0)	4.1
12-1	1000 rev, 80% pulp/20% Sample 17, no chemical	20	1000	cmf	100	9246 (1213)	4.1
13-1	2500 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	10	2500	cmf	100	13583 (1782.6)	4.7
14-1	6000 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	10	6000	cmf	103	15494 (2033.3)	5.0
15-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/ cmf Sample 17, CMC4,WSR20,DB0	20	1000	cmf	99	12167 (1596.7)	4.8

Table 5 – 16 lb. (6.8 kg) Sheet Data (cont'd)

Run#	Description	cmf	refining	cmf source	Formation Index	Tensile g/3 in (g/cm)	Stretch %
16-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/ cmf Sample 17, CMC6,WSR30, DB15	20	1000	cmf	90	11725 (1538.7)	4.7
17-1	0 revs,80/20 pulp/ cmf Sample 17,CMC4,WSR20, DB15	20	0	cmf	86	7575 (994.1)	4.2
18-1	0 rev, 80/20 pulp/ cmf Sample 17, CMC4,WSR20, DB0	20	0	cmf	94	8303 (1090)	4.2
19-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf tank 3,CMC 4, WSR20, DB 0	20	1000	refined 6 mm	97	11732 (1539.6)	4.9
20-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf tank 3,CMC 6,WSR 30, DB15	20	1000	refined 6 mm	89	11881 (1559.2)	4.8
21-1	0 rev, 80/20pulp/cmf tank 3, CMC 4, WSR 20, DB15	20	0	refined 6 mm	85	6104 (801.1)	3.4
22-1	0 rev,80/20 pulp/cmf tank 3, CMC 4,WSR 20, DB0	20	0	refined 6 mm	92	8003 (1050)	4.4

Table 5 – 16 lb. (6.8 kg) Sheet Data (cont'd)

Run#	Description	T.E.A MD mm-gm/ mm^2	Opacity TAPPI Opacity Units	Opacity Scat. Coef. m^2/kg	Opacity Absorp. Coef. m^2/kg	Break Modulus gms/%	Wet Tens Finch g/3 in. (g/cm)
1-1	0 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	1.514	54.9	34.58	0.0000	1,419	94 (12)
2-1	1000 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	3.737	50.2	29.94	0.0000	2,861	119 (15.6)
3-1	2500 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	4.638	48.3	28.08	0.0000	3,076	172 (22.6)
4-1	6000 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	5.174	41.9	22.96	0.0000	3,403	275 (36.1)
5-1	0 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf tank 3, no chemical	1.989	60.1	43.96	0.0763	1,596	107 (14.0)
6-1	1000 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf tank 3, no chemical	3.710	53.5	34.84	0.0000	2,387	105 (13.8)
7-1	1000 rev, 80% pulp/20% cmf tank 3, no chemical	2.757	63.2	47.87	0.0000	2,212	96 (13)
8-1	2500 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf tank 3, no chemical	4.990	53.4	34.43	0.0000	2,309	121 (15.9)
9-1	6000 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf, no chemical	5.689	50.0	29.37	0.0000	3,074	171 (22.4)
10-1	0 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf Sample 17, no chemical	2.605	62.8	48.24	0.0000	1,538	69 (9.0)
11-1	1000 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	3.344	57.3	39.93	0.0000	2,633	121 (15.9)
12-1	1000 rev, 80% pulp/20% Sample 17, no chemical	2.815	62.6	49.60	0.0000	2,242	97 (13)
13-1	2500 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	4.685	53.9	35.00	0.0000	2,929	122 (16.0)
14-1	6000 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	5.503	48.0	28.76	0.0000	3,075	171 (22.4)
15-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf Sample 17,CMC4,WSR20,DB0	4.366	65.2	52.56	0.3782	2,531	4,592 (602.6)
16-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf Sample 17,CMC6,WSR30,DB15	3.962	64.8	53.31	0.3920	2,472	5,439 (713.8)
17-1	0 revs,80/20 pulp/cmf Sample 17, CMC4,WSR20,DB15	2.529	75.1	59.34	0.3761	1,801	4,212 (552.8)
18-1	0 rev, 80/20 pulp/cmf Sample 17, CMC4, WSR20, DB0	2.704	67.4	56.16	0.3774	1,968	3,781 (496.2)
19-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf tank 3,CMC 4, WSR20, DB 0	4.270	59.4	44.67	0.3988	2,403	4,265 (559.7)
20-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf tank 3,CMC 6,WSR 30,DB15	4.195	64.7	49.98	0.3686	2,499	5,163 (677.6)
21-1	0 rev, 80/20pulp/cmf tank 3, CMC 4, WSR 20, DB 15	1.597	67.1	54.38	0.3689	1,773	3,031 (397.8)
22-1	0 rev,80/20 pulp/cmf tank 3, CMC 4,WSR 20,DB 0	2.754	64.4	50.38	0.3771	1,842	3,343 (438.7)

WO 2009/038735 PCT/US2008/010840 CA 02707515 2010-02-10

Table 5 – 16 lb. (6.8 kg) Sheet Data (cont'd)

Run#	Description	Basis Weight Raw Wt g	Caliper 5 Sheet mils/ 5 sht (µm/5 sht)	Basis Weight g/m^2	Freeness (CSF) mL	Wet/Dry	Basis Weight lb/3000ft^2
1-1	0 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	0.534	13.95 (354.3)	26.72	503	1.6%	16.4
2-1	1000 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	0.537	11.69 (296.9)	26.86	452	1.0%	16.5
3-1	2500 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	0.533	11.20 (284.5)	26.64	356	1.2%	16.4
4-1	6000 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	0.516	9.67 (245)	25.79	194	1.7%	15.8
5-1	0 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf tank 3, no chemical	0.524	13.70 (348.0)	26.21	341	1.7%	16.1
6-1	1000 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf tank 3, no chemical	0.536	12.03 (305.6)	26.81	315	1.0%	16.5
7-1	1000 rev, 80% pulp/20% cmf tank 3, no chemical	0.543	12.73 (323.3)	27.16	143	1.0%	16.7
8-1	2500 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf tank 3, no chemical	0.527	11.11 (282.2)	26.37	176	1.0%	16.2
9-1	6000 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf, no chemical	0.546	10.58 (268.7)	27.31	101	1.1%	16.8
10-1	0 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf Sample 17, no chemical	0.526	15.77 (400.6)	26.32	150	1.0%	16.2
11-1	1000 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	0.523	13.50 (342.9)	26.15	143	1.1%	16.1
12-1	1000 rev, 80% pulp/20% Sample 17, no chemical	0.510	11.23 (285.2)	25.48	75	1.0%	15.6
13-1	2500 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	0.526	10.53 (267.5)	26.28	108	0.9%	16.1
14-1	6000 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	0.520	9.79 (249)	26.01	70	1.1%	16.0
15-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf Sample 17,CMC4,WSR20,DB0	0.529	11.97 (304.0)	26.44	163	37.7%	16.2
16-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf Sample 17,CMC6,WSR30,DB15	0.510	11.80 (299.7)	25.51	115	46.4%	15.7
17-1	0 revs,80/20 pulp/cmf Sample 17, CMC4,WSR20,DB15	0.532	16.43 (417.3)	26.59	146	55.6%	16.3

Table 5 – 16 lb. (6.8 kg) Sheet Data (cont'd)

Run#	Description	Basis Weight Raw Wt g	Caliper 5 Sheet mils/5 sht (µm/5 sht)	Basis Weight g/m^2	Freeness (CSF) mL	Wet/Dry	Basis Weight lb/3000ft^2
18-1	0 rev, 80/20 pulp/cmf Sample 17, CMC 4, WSR20, DB0	0.530	13.46 (341.9)	26.50	170	45.5%	16.3
19-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf tank 3,CMC 4, WSR20, DB 0	0.501	12.24 (310.9)	25.07	261	36.4%	15.4
20-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf tank 3,CMC 6,WSR 30,DB15	0.543	13.55 (344.2)	27.13	213	43.5%	16.7
21-1	0 rev, 80/20pulp/cmf tank 3, CMC 4, WSR 20, DB 15	0.542	15.05 (382.3)	27.10	268	49.6%	16.6
22-1	0 rev,80/20 pulp/cmf tank 3, CMC 4,WSR 20,DB 0	0.530	14.22 (361.2)	26.52	281	41.8%	16.3

Table 5 – 16 lb. (6.8 kg) Sheet Data (cont'd)

Run#	Description	Dry Breaking Length, m	Wet Breaking Length, m	RBA
1-1	0 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	2941	46	0.16100836
2-1	1000 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	5822	58	0.27375122
3-1	2500 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	7071	85	0.31886175
4-1	6000 rev, 100% pulp, no chemical	8185	140	0.44311455
5-1	0 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf tank 3, no chemical	3236	53	0.19494363
6-1	1000 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf tank 3, no chemical	5238	51	0.36183869
7-1	1000 rev, 80% pulp/20% cmf tank 3, no chemical	4460	46	
8-1	2500 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf tank 3, no chemical	6117	60	0.36938921
9-1	6000 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf, no chemical	7328	82	0.46212845
10-1	0 rev, 90% pulp/10% cmf Sample 17, no chemical	3575	34	0.24976453
11-1	1000 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	5404	61	0.37906447
12-1	1000 rev, 80% pulp/20% Sample 17, no chemical	4762	50	
13-1	2500 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	6782	61	0.45566074
14-1	6000 rev, 90% pulp/10% Sample 17, no chemical	7818	86	0.55273449
15-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf Sample 17,CMC4,WSR20,DB0	6038	2279	
16-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf Sample 7,CMC6,WSR30,DB15	6031	2798	
17-1	0 revs,80/20 pulp/cmf Sample 17, MC4,WSR20,DB15	3738	2078	
18-1	0 rev, 80/20 pulp/cmf Sample 17, CMC4, WSR20,DB0	4113	1873	

Table 5 – 16 lb. (6.8 kg) Sheet Data (cont'd)

Run#	Description	Dry Breaking Length, m	Wet Breaking Length, m	RBA
19-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf tank 3,CMC 4, WSR20, DB 0	6141	2232	
20-1	1000rev,80/20pulp/cmf tank 3,CMC 6,WSR 30,DB15	5747	2498	
21-1	0 rev, 80/20pulp/cmf tank 3, CMC 4, WSR 20, DB 15	2956	1467	
22-1	0 rev,80/20 pulp/cmf tank 3, CMC 4,WSR 20,DB 0	3961	1654	

WO 2009/038735 PCT/US2008/010840 2010-02-10 CA 02707515

These results and additional results also appear in **Figures 7-12**. Particularly noteworthy are **Figures 7** and **10**. In **Figure 7** it is seen that sheet made from pulp-derived fiber exhibits a scattering coefficient of less than $50m^2/kg$, while sheet made with lyocell microfiber exhibits scattering coefficients of generally more than 50 m^2/kg. In **Figure 10** it is seen that very high wet/dry tensile ratios are readily achieved; 50% or more.

It should be appreciated from **Figures 8, 9, 11** and **12** that the use of microfiber favorably influences the opacity/breaking length relationship typically seen in paper products.

This latter feature of the invention is likewise seen in **Figure 13** which shows the impact of adding microfiber to softwood handsheets.

Examples 23-48

Another series of handsheets were produced with various levels of refining, debonder, cellulose microfiber and strength resins were prepared following the procedures noted above. Details and results appear in Table 6 and in **Figure 14-16** wherein it is seen that the microfiber increases opacity and bulk particularly.

Table 6 – Handsheets with Debonder and Lyocell Microfiber

Sheet #	Description	% cmf	lb/t (kg/ton) Varisoft	Pulp refining, PFI revs	Addition method	Basis Weight lb/3000 ft^2 (gsm)	Basis Weight Raw Wtg	Caliper 5 Sheet mils/5 sht (µm/5 sht)	Opacity TAPPI Opacity Units
1-1	100% NBSK - 0 rev ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	0	0	0	NA	16.04 (26.10)	0.522	14.58 (370.3)	50.9
2-1	100% NBSK - 0 rev ; 10 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	0	10 (5)	0	NA	16.92 (27.54)	0.551	15.20 (386.1)	53.9
3-1	100% NBSK - 0 rev ; 20 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	0	20 (10)	0	NA	16.20 (26.37)	0.527	15.21 (386.3)	54.4
4-1	100% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	0	0	1000	NA	16.69 (27.16)	0.543	13.49 (342.6)	50.7
5-1	100% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 10 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	0	10 (5)	1000	NA	16.72 (27.21)	0.544	13.54 (343.9)	50.9
6-1	100% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 20 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	0	20 (10)	1000	NA	16.25 (26.45)	0.529	13.33 (338.6)	52.2
7-1	100% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 40 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	0	40 (20)	1000	NA	16.62 (27.05)	0.541	13.61 (345.7)	56.3
8-1	100% cmf ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	100	0		NA	17.23 (28.04)	0.561	17.75 (450.9)	86.6
9-1	100% cmf ; 10 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	100	10 (5)		NA	17.00 (27.67)	0.553	17.45 (443.2)	86.2
10-1	100% cmf ; 20 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	100	20 (10)		NA	17.30 (28.16)	0.563	18.01 (457.4)	87.6

Table 6 – Handsheets with Debonder and Lyocell Microfiber (cont'd)

Sheet #	Description	% cmf	lb/t (kg/ton) Varisoft	Pulp refining, PFI revs	Addition method	Basis Weight lb/3000 ft^2 (gsm)	Basis Weight Raw Wtg	Caliper 5 Sheet mils/5 sht (µm/5 sht)	Opacity TAPPI Opacity Units
11-1	100% cmf ; 40 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	100	40 (20)		NA	16.81 (27.36)	0.547	19.30 (490.2)	88.8
12-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	50	0	0	NA	17.14 (27.89)	0.558	16.14 (410.0)	79.5
13-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 10 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	50	10 (5)	0	split to cmf	16.90 (27.50)	0.550	16.11 (409.2)	79.5
14-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 20 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	50	20 (10)	0	split to cmf	16.15 (26.28)	0.526	16.11 (409.2)	79.1
15-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 20 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	50	20 (10)	0	blend	17.05 (27.75)	0.555	16.39 (416.3)	81.2

Table 6 – Handsheets with Debonder and Lyocell Microfiber (cont'd)

Sheet #	Description	% cmf	lb/t (kg/ton) Varisoft	Pulp refining, PFI revs	Addition method	Basis Weight lb/3000 ft^2 (gsm)	Basis Weight Raw Wtg	Caliper 5 Sheet mils/ 5 sht (µm/5 sht)	Opacity TAPPI Opacity Units
16-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 10 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	50	10 (5)	0	split to NBSK	16.72 (27.21)	0.544	15.77 (400.6)	77.7
17-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 20 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	50	20 (10)	0	split to NBSK	16.79 (27.33)	0.547	15.91 (404.1)	79.3
18-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK-1000 rev ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	50	0	1000	NA	16.85 (27.42)	0.549	15.13 (384.3)	77.0
19-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK-1000 rev ; 10 lb/t Varisoft C	50	10 (5)	1000	split to cmf	16.38 (26.66)	0.533	14.85 (377.2)	77.1
20-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK -1000 rev ; 20 lb/t Varisoft C	50	20 (10)	1000	split to cmf	17.25 (28.07)	0.561	16.14 (410.0)	80.4
21-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 40 lb/t Varisoft C	50	40 (20)	1000	split to cmf	17.19 (27.98)	0.560	16.59 (421.4)	81.7
22-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 20 lb/t Varisoft C	50	0	1000	blend	16.50 (26.85)	0.537	14.78 (375.4)	77.2
23-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 10 lb/t Varisoft C	50	10 (5)	1000	split to NBSK	16.63 (27.06)	0.541	15.14 (384.6)	77.4
24-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 20 lb/t Varisoft C	50	20 (10)	1000	split to NBSK	16.89 (27.49)	0.550	15.33 (389.4)	79.5
25-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 40 lb/t Varisoft C	50	40 (20)	1000	split to NBSK	16.33 (26.58)	0.532	15.66 (397.8)	80.0

Table 6 – Handsheets with Debonder and Lyocell Microfiber (cont'd)

Sheet #	Description	Basis Weight g/m^2	Opacity Scat. Coef. m^2/kg	Bulk cm^3/g	Opacity Absorp. Coef. m^2/kg	Breaking Length 3-in. (7.62 cm) km	Tensile Modulus HS-3 in (7.62 cm) gms/%	Stretch HS 3-in (7.62 cm) %	TEA HS 3-in (7.62 cm) g/mm
1-1	100% NBSK - 0 rev ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	26.11	32.02	2.838	0.77	1.49	1,630.623	1.822	0.312
2-1	100% NBSK - 0 rev ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	27.54	33.78	2.805	0.73	0.86	1,295.520	1.400	0.128
3-1	100% NBSK - 0 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	26.37	36.02	2.930	0.76	0.64	918.044	1.392	0.086
4-1	100% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	27.16	30.86	2.523	0.74	3.37	2,394.173	2.937	1.391
5-1	100% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	27.21	30.94	2.527	0.73	2.00	2,185.797	1.900	0.444
6-1	100% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	26.45	33.43	2.560	0.76	1.68	1,911.295	1.778	0.334
7-1	100% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 40 lb/t (20 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	27.04	37.79	2.556	0.74	1.42	1,750.098	1.678	0.281
8-1	100% cmf ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	28.05	139.34	3.215	0.36	1.84	1,311.535	3.022	0.852
9-1	100% cmf ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	27.66	136.57	3.204	0.36	1.56	1,289.616	2.556	0.575
10-1	100% cmf ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	28.16	145.61	3.249	0.36	1.25	1,052.958	2.555	0.437

Table 6 – Handsheets with Debonder and Lyocell Microfiber (cont'd)

Sheet #	Description	Basis Weight g/m^2	Opacity Scat. Coef. m^2/kg	Bulk cm^3/g	Opacity Absorp. Coef. m^2/kg	Breaking Length 3-in. (7.62 cm) km	Tensile Modulus HS-3 in (7.62 cm) gms/%	Stretch HS 3-in (7.62 cm) %	TEA HS 3-in (7.62 cm) g/mm
11-1	100% cmf ; 40 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	27.36	162.62	3.583	0.37	0.73	529.223	2.878	0.317
12-1	50% cmf/50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	27.89	93.93	2.939	0.36	1.88	1,486.862	2.700	0.731
13-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	27.50	94.77	2.977	0.36	1.37	1,195.921	2.412	0.431
14-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	26.29	97.15	3.114	0.38	0.97	853.814	2.300	0.292
15-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	27.76	101.74	3.000	0.36	1.10	1,056.968	2.222	0.363
16-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	27.22	88.11	2.944	0.37	1.39	1,150.015	2.522	0.467
17-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	27.33	94.47	2.958	0.37	1.14	1,067.909	2.222	0.375
18-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK-1000 rev ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	27.43	85.17	2.802	0.36	2.27	1,506.162	3.156	1.096
19-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK-1000 rev ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft C	26.65	87.73	2.831	0.38	1.63	1,197.047	2.778	0.587
20-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK -1000 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft C	28.07	97.20	2.921	0.36	1.26	1,051.156	2.592	0.480

Table 6 – Handsheets with Debonder and Lyocell Microfiber (cont'd)

Sheet #	Description	Basis Weight g/m^2	Opacity Scat. Coef. m^2/kg	Bulk cm^3/g	Opacity Absorp. Coef. m^2/kg	Breaking Length 3-in. (7.62 cm) km	Tensile Modulus HS-3 in (7.62 cm) gms/%	Stretch HS 3-in (7.62 cm) %	TEA HS 3-in (7.62 cm) g/mm
21-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 40 lb/t (20 kg/ton) Varisoft C	27.98	104.01	3.012	0.36	0.86	816.405	2.256	0.266
22-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft C	26.86	87.65	2.796	0.37	2.22	1,400.670	3.267	1.042
23-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft C	27.07	87.78	2.841	0.37	1.75	1,396.741	2.614	0.626
24-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft C	27.49	95.53	2.833	0.36	1.35	1,296.112	2.200	0.417
25-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 40 lb/t (20 kg/ton) Varisoft C	26.58	100.22	2.994	0.38	1.02	937.210	2.211	0.312

Table 6 – Handsheets with Debonder and Lyocell Microfiber (cont'd)

Sheet #	Description	Tensile HS 3-in (7.62 cm) g/3 in (g/cm)
1-1	100% NBSK - 0 rev ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	2,969.539 (389.7033)
2-1	100% NBSK - 0 rev ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	1,810.456 (237.5927)
3-1	100% NBSK - 0 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	1,278.806 (167.8223)
4-1	100% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	6,992.244 (917.6173)
5-1	100% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	4,150.495 (544.6844)
6-1	100% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 20 lb/t 10 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	3,387.215 (444.5164)
7-1	100% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 40 lb/t (20 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	2,932.068 (384.7858)
8-1	100% cmf ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	3,944.432 (517.6420)
9-1	100% cmf; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	3,292.803 (432.1264)
10-1	100% cmf; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	2,684.076 (352.2409)
11-1	100% cmf; 40 lb/t (20 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	1,521.815 (199.7133)
12-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	3,993.424 (524.0714)
13-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	2,867.809 (376.3529)
14-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	1,947.234 (255.5425)

Table 6 – Handsheets with Debonder and Lyocell Microfiber (cont'd)

Sheet #	Description	Tensile HS 3-in (7.62 cm) g/3 in (g/cm)
15-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	2,335.337 (306.4747)
16-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	2,890.722 (379.3598)
17-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 0 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft GP - C	2,372.417 (311.3408)
18-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK-1000 rev ; 0 lb/t Varisoft GP - C	4,750.895 (623.4770)
19-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK-1000 rev ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton)Varisoft C	3,308.207 (434.1479)
20-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK -1000 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft C	2,705.497 (355.0521)
21-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 40 lb/t (20 kg/ton) Varisoft C	1,835.452 (240.8730)
22-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft C	4,549.488 (597.0457)
23-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 10 lb/t (5 kg/ton) Varisoft C	3,608.213 (473.5188)
24-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 20 lb/t (10 kg/ton) Varisoft C	2,841.376 (372.8840)
25-1	50% cmf /50% NBSK - 1000 rev ; 40 lb/t (20 kg/ton) Varisoft C	2,072.885 (272.0322)

Examples 49-51

Following generally the same procedures, additional handsheets were made with 100% fibrillated lyocell with and without dry strength resin and wet strength resin. Details and results appear in Table 7 and **Figure 17**.

It is seen from this data that conventional wet and dry strength resins can be used to make cellulosic sheet comparable in strength to conventional cellulosic sheet and that unusually high wet/dry ratios are achieved.

Table 7 – 100% Lyocell Handsheets

Example	Description	Basis Weight lb/3000 ft^2 (gsm)	Basis Weight Raw Wt g	Tensile MD g/3 in (g/cm)	Stretch MD %	T.E.A. MD mm-gm/ mm^2	Wet Tens Finch Cured-MD g/3 in. (g/cm)	Dry breaking length, m	Wet Breaking length, m	W/D
49	No chemical	16.34 (26.59)	0.532	3493 (458.4)	2.8	0.678	18 (2.4)	1722	0	0.0%
50	4/20 cmc/Amres	17.37 (28.27)	0.565	5035 (660.8)	3.9	1.473	1,943 (255.0)	2335	901	38.6%
51	8/40 cmc/Amres	16.02 (26.07)	0.521	5738 (753.0)	4.8	2.164	2,694 (353.5)	2887	1355	46.9%

5

The present invention also includes production methods such as a method of making absorbent cellulosic sheet comprising: (a) preparing an aqueous furnish with a fiber mixture including from about 90 percent to about 25 percent of a pulp-derived papermaking fiber, the fiber mixture also including from about 10 to 75 percent by weight of regenerated cellulose microfibers having a CSF value of less than 175 ml; (b) depositing the aqueous furnish on a foraminous support to form a nascent web and at least partially dewatering the nascent web; and (c) drying the web to provide absorbent sheet. Typically, the aqueous furnish has a consistency of 2 percent or less; even more typically, the aqueous furnish has a consistency of 1 percent or less. The nascent web may be compactively dewatered with a papermaking felt and applied to a Yankee dryer and creped therefrom. Alternatively, the compactively dewatered web is applied to a rotating cylinder and fabric-creped therefrom or the nascent web is at least partially dewatered by throughdrying or the nascent web is at least partially dewatered by impingement air drying. In many cases fiber mixture includes softwood Kraft and hardwood Kraft.

Figure 18 illustrates one way of practicing the present invention where a machine chest **50**, which may be compartmentalized, is used for preparing furnishes that are treated with chemicals having different functionality depending on the character of the various fibers used. This embodiment shows a divided headbox thereby making it possible to produce a stratified product. The product according to the present invention can be made with single or multiple headboxes, **20, 20'** and regardless of the number of headboxes may be stratified or unstratified. A layer may embody the sheet characteristics described herein in a multilayer structure wherein other strata do not. The treated furnish is transported through different conduits **40** and **41**, where it is delivered to the headbox of a crescent forming machine **10** as is well known, although any convenient configuration can be used.

Figure 18 shows a web-forming end or wet end with a liquid permeable foraminous support member **11** which may be of any convenient configuration. Foraminous support member **11** may be constructed of any of several known materials including photopolymer fabric, felt, fabric or a synthetic filament woven mesh base with a very fine synthetic fiber batt attached to the mesh base. The foraminous support member **11** is supported in a conventional manner on rolls, including breast roll **15**, and pressing roll, **16**.

Forming fabric **12** is supported on rolls **18** and **19** which are positioned relative to the breast roll **15** for guiding the forming wire **12** to converge on the foraminous support member **11** at the cylindrical breast roll **15** at an acute angle relative to the foraminous support member **11**. The foraminous support member **11** and the wire **12** move at the same speed and in the same direction which is the direction of rotation of the breast roll **15**. The forming wire **12** and the foraminous support member **11** converge at an upper surface of the forming roll **15** to form a wedge-shaped space or nip into which one or more jets of water or foamed liquid fiber dispersion may be injected and trapped between the forming wire **12** and the foraminous support member **11** to force fluid through the wire **12** into a save-all **22** where it is collected for re-use in the process (recycled via line **24)**.

The nascent web **W** formed in the process is carried along the machine direction **30** by the foraminous support member **11** to the pressing roll **16** where the wet nascent web **W** is transferred to the Yankee dryer **26**. Fluid is pressed from the wet web **W** by pressing roll **16** as the web is transferred to the Yankee dryer **26** where it is dried and creped by means of a creping blade **27**. The finished web is collected on a take-up roll **28**.

A pit **44** is provided for collecting water squeezed from the furnish by the press roll **16,** as well as collecting the water removed from the fabric by a Uhle

box **29**. The water collected in pit **44** may be collected into a flow line **45** for separate processing to remove surfactant and fibers from the water and to permit recycling of the water back to the papermaking machine **10**.

Examples 51-59

Using a CWP apparatus of the class shown in **Figure 18**, a series of absorbent sheets were made with softwood furnishes including refined lyocell fiber. The general approach was to prepare a Kraft softwood/ microfiber blend in a mixing tank and dilute the furnish to a consistency of less than 1% at the headbox. Tensile was adjusted with wet and dry strength resins.

Details and results appear in Table 8:

WO 2009/038735

CA 02707515 2010-02-10

PCT/US2008/010840

Table 8 – CWP Creped Sheets

CWP#	Percent Pulp	Percent Micro-fiber	Chemistry	Caliper 8 sheet mils/8 sht (µm/8 sht)	Basis Weight lb/3000 ft^2 (gsm)	Tensile MD g/3 in (g/cm)	Stretch MD %	Tensile CD g/3 in (g/cm)	Stretch CD %	Wet Tens Finch Cured-CD g/3 in (g/cm)	Break Modulus CD gms/%	Break Modulus MD gms/%	SAT g/g	Void Volume Ratio cc/g
12-1	100	0	None	29.6 (752)	9.6 (16)	686 (90.0)	23.9	500 (65.6)	5.4		83	29	9.4	4.9
13-1	75	25	None	34.3 (871)	11.2 (18.2)	1405 (184.4)	31.6	1000 (131.2)	5.8		178	44	6.8	4.5
14-1	50	50	None	37.8 (960)	10.8 (17.6)	1264 (195.9)	31.5	790 (103.7)	8.5		94	40	7.9	5.3
15-1	50	50	4 lb/T (2 kg/ton) cmc and 20 lb/T (10 kg/ton) Amres	31.4 (798)	11.0 (17.9)	1633 (214.3)	31.2	1093 (143.4)	9.1	396 (52.0)	122	53	6.6	4.2
16-1	75	25	4 lb/T (2 kg/ton) cmc and 20 lb/T (10 kg/ton) Amres	30.9 (785)	10.8 (17.6)	1205 (158.1)	29.5	956 (125)	6.2	323 (42.4)	166	35	7.1	4.5
17-1	75	25	4 lb/T (2 kg/ton) cmc and 20 lb/T (10 kg/ton) Amres	32.0 (813)	10.5 (17.1)	1452 (190.6)	32.6	1080 (141.7)	5.7	284 (37.3)	186	46	7.0	4.0
18-1	100	0	4 lb/T (2 kg/ton) cmc and 20 lb/T (10 kg/ton) Amres	28.4 (721)	10.8 (17.6)	1931 (253.4)	28.5	1540 (202.1)	4.9	501 (65.7)	297	70	8.6	3.4
19-1	100	0	4 lb/T (2 kg/ton) cmc and 20 lb/T (10 kg/ton) Amres	26.2 (665)	10.2 (16.6)	1742 (228.6)	27.6	1499 (196.7)	5.1	364 (47.8)	305	66	7.6	3.8

Instead of a conventional wet-press process, a wet-press, fabric creping process may be employed to make the inventive wipers. Preferred aspects of processes including fabric-creping are described in the following co-pending applications United States Patent Application Serial No. 11/804,246 (Publication No. US 2008-0029235), filed May 16, 2007, entitled "Fabric Creped Absorbent Sheet with Variable Local Basis Weight" (Attorney Docket No. 20179; GP-06-11); United States Patent Application Serial No. 11/678,669 (Publication No. US 2007-0204966), entitled "Method of Controlling Adhesive Build-Up on a Yankee Dryer" (Attorney Docket No. 20140; GP-06-1); United States Patent Application Serial No. 11/451,112 (Publication No. US 2006-0289133), filed June 12, 2006, entitled "Fabric-Creped Sheet for Dispensers" (Attorney Docket No. 20195; GP-06-12); United States Patent Application Serial No. 11/451,111, filed June 12, 2006 (Publication No. US 2006-0289134), entitled "Method of Making Fabric-creped Sheet for Dispensers" (Attorney Docket No. 20079; GP-05-10); United States Patent Application Serial No. 11/402,609 (Publication No. US 2006-0237154), filed April 12, 2006, entitled "Multi-Ply Paper Towel With Absorbent Core" (Attorney Docket No. 12601; GP-04-11); United States Patent Application Serial No. 11/151,761, filed June 14, 2005 (Publication No. US 2005-/0279471), entitled "High Solids Fabric-crepe Process for Producing Absorbent Sheet with In-Fabric Drying" (Attorney Docket 12633; GP-03-35); United States Patent Application Serial No. 11/108,458, filed April 18, 2005 (Publication No. US 2005-0241787), entitled "Fabric-Crepe and In Fabric Drying Process for Producing Absorbent Sheet" (Attorney Docket 12611P1; GP-03-33-1); United States Patent Application Serial No. 11/108,375, filed April 18, 2005 (Publication No. US 2005-0217814), entitled "Fabric-crepe/Draw Process for Producing Absorbent Sheet" (Attorney Docket No. 12389P1; GP-02-12-1); United States Patent Application Serial No. 11/104,014, filed April 12, 2005 (Publication No. US 2005-0241786), entitled "Wet-Pressed Tissue and Towel Products With Elevated CD Stretch and Low Tensile Ratios Made With a High Solids Fabric-Crepe Process" (Attorney Docket 12636; GP-04-5); see also United States Patent

No. 7,399,378, issued July 15, 2008, entitled "Fabric-crepe Process for Making Absorbent Sheet" (Attorney Docket. 12389; GP-02-12); United States Patent Application Serial No. 12/033,207, filed February 19, 2008, entitled "Fabric Crepe Process With Prolonged Production Cycle" (Attorney Docket 20216; GP-06-16). The applications and patent referred to immediately above are particularly relevant to the selection of machinery, materials, processing conditions and so forth as to fabric creped products of the present invention.

Liquid Porosimetry

Liquid porosimetry is a procedure for determining the pore volume distribution (PVD) within a porous solid matrix. Each pore is sized according to its effective radius, and the contribution of each size to the total free volume is the principal objective of the analysis. The data reveals useful information about the structure of a porous network, including absorption and retention characteristics of a material.

The procedure generally requires quantitative monitoring of the movement of liquid either into or out of a porous structure. The effective radius R of a pore is operationally defined by the Laplace equation:

$$R = \frac{2\gamma \cos\theta}{\Delta P}$$

where γ is liquid surface tension, θ is advancing or receding contact angle of the liquid, and ΔP is pressure difference across the liquid/air meniscus. For liquid to enter or drain from a pore, an external pressure must be applied that is just enough to overcome the Laplace ΔP. Cos θ is negative when liquid must be forced in; cos θ is positive when it must be forced out. If the external pressure on a matrix

having a range of pore sizes is changed, either continuously or in steps, filling or emptying will start with the largest pore and proceed in turn down to the smallest size that corresponds to the maximum applied pressure difference. Porosimetry involves recording the increment of liquid that enters or leaves with each pressure change and can be carried out in the extrusion mode; that is, liquid is forced out of the porous network rather than into it. The receding contact angle is the appropriate term in the Laplace relationship, and any stable liquid that has a known $\cos\theta_r > 0$ can be used. If necessary, initial saturation with liquid can be accomplished by preevacuation of the dry material. The basic arrangement used for extrusion porosimetry measurements is illustrated in **Figure 19**. The presaturated specimen is placed on a microporous membrane which is itself supported by a rigid porous plate. The gas pressure within the chamber was increased in steps, causing liquid to flow out of some of the pores, largest ones first. The amount of liquid removed is monitored by the top-loading recording balance. In this way, each level of applied pressure (which determines the largest effective pore size that remains filled) is related to an increment of liquid mass. The chamber was pressurized by means of a computer-controlled, reversible, motor-driven piston/cylinder arrangement that can produce the required changes in pressure to cover a pore radius range from 1 to 1000 μm. Further details concerning the apparatus employed are seen in *Miller et al.*, Liquid Porosimetry: New Methodology and Applications, J. of Colloid and Interface Sci., 162, 163-170 (1994) (TRI/Princeton). It will be appreciated by one of skill in the art that an effective Laplace radius, R, can be determined by any suitable technique; preferably using an automated apparatus to record pressure and weight changes.

Utilizing the apparatus of **Figure 19** and water with 0.1% TX-100 wetting agent (surface tension 30 dyne/cm) (300 μN/cm) as the absorbed/extruded liquid, the PVD of a variety of samples were measured by extrusion porosimetry in an

uncompressed mode. Alternatively, the test can be conducted in an intrusion mode if so desired.

Sample A was a CWP basesheet prepared from 100% northern bleached softwood Kraft (NBSK) fiber. Sample B was a like CWP sheet made with 25% regenerated cellulose microfiber and sample C was also a like CWP sheet made with 50% regenerated cellulose microfiber and 50% NBSK fiber. Details and results appear in Table 9 below, and in **Figures 20, 21** and **22** for these samples. The pore radius intervals are indicated in Cols. 1 and 5 only for brevity.

WO 2009/038735 PCT/US2008/010840 CA 02707515 2010-02-10

Table 9 – CWP Porosity Distribution

Pore Radius, micron	Capillary Pressure, mmH2O	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample A, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample A, %	Pore Radius, micron	Pore Volume Sample A, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample B, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample B, %	Pore Volume Sample B, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample C, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample C, %	Pore Volume Sample C, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Capillary Pressure, mmH_2O
500	12	7.84	100	400	5.518	5.843	100	3.943	5.5	100	2.806	12.3
300	20	6.74	85.93	250	10.177	5.054	86.5	8.25	4.938	89.79	3.979	20.4
200	31	5.72	72.95	187.5	13.902	4.229	72.38	9.482	4.54	82.56	4.336	30.6
175	35	5.38	68.52	162.5	12.933	3.992	68.33	8.642	4.432	80.59	4.425	35
150	41	5.05	64.4	137.5	13.693	3.776	64.63	7.569	4.321	78.58	4.9	40.8
125	49	4.71	60.04	117.5	15.391	3.587	61.39	9.022	4.199	76.35	4.306	49
110	56	4.48	57.09	105	14.619	3.452	59.07	7.595	4.134	75.18	3.86	55.7
100	61	4.33	55.23	95	13.044	3.376	57.78	7.297	4.096	74.47	4.009	61.3
90	68	4.20	53.57	85	15.985	3.303	56.53	6.649	4.056	73.74	2.821	68.1
80	77	4.04	51.53	75	18.781	3.236	55.39	4.818	4.027	73.23	2.45	76.6
70	88	3.85	49.13	65	18.93	3.188	54.56	4.811	4.003	72.79	3.192	87.5
60	102	3.66	46.72	55	30.441	3.14	53.74	0.806	3.971	72.21	0.445	102.1
50	123	3.36	42.84	47.5	40.749	3.132	53.6	11.021	3.967	72.12	13.512	122.5
45	136	3.16	40.24	42.5	48.963	3.077	52.66	15.027	3.899	70.9	21.678	136.1
40	153	2.91	37.12	37.5	65.448	3.002	51.37	17.22	3.791	68.93	34.744	153.1
35	175	2.58	32.95	32.5	83.255	2.916	49.9	25.44	3.617	65.77	53.155	175
30	204	2.17	27.64	27.5	109.136	2.788	47.72	36.333	3.351	60.93	89.829	204.2
25	245	1.62	20.68	22.5	94.639	2.607	44.61	69.934	2.902	52.77	119.079	245
20	306	1.15	14.65	18.75	82.496	2.257	38.63	104.972	2.307	41.94	104.529	306.3
17.5	350	0.94	12.02	16.25	71.992	1.995	34.14	119.225	2.045	37.19	93.838	350

Table 9 – CWP Porosity Distribution (cont'd)

Pore Radius, micron	Capillary Pressure, mmH2O	Cumulative (Cumul.) Pore Volume Sample A, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample A, %	Pore Radius, micron	Pore Volume Sample A, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample B, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample B, %	Pore Volume Sample B, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample C, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample C, %	Pore Volume Sample C, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Capillary Pressure, mmH_2O
15	408	0.76	9.73	13.75	55.568	1.697	29.04	125.643	1.811	32.92	92.65	408.3
12.5	490	0.62	7.95	11.25	58.716	1.382	23.66	120.581	1.579	28.71	100.371	490
10	613	0.48	6.08	9.5	58.184	1.081	18.5	102.703	1.328	24.15	84.632	612.5
9	681	0.42	5.34	8.5	71.164	0.978	16.74	119.483	1.244	22.61	104.677	680.6
8	766	0.35	4.43	7.5	65.897	0.859	14.7	92.374	1.139	20.71	94.284	765.6
7	875	0.28	3.59	6.5	78.364	0.766	13.12	116.297	1.045	18.99	103.935	875
6	1021	0.20	2.6	5.5	93.96	0.65	11.13	157.999	0.941	17.1	83.148	1020.8
5	1225	0.11	1.4	4.5	21.624	0.492	8.42	91.458	0.857	15.59	97.996	1225
4	1531	0.09	1.12	3.5	23.385	0.401	6.86	120.222	0.759	13.81	198.218	1531.3
3	2042	0.07	0.82	2.5	64.584	0.28	4.8	176.691	0.561	10.21	311.062	2041.7
2	3063	0.00	0	1.5	12.446	0.104	1.78	103.775	0.25	4.55	250.185	3062.5
1	6125	0.01	0.16			0	0		0	0		6125
			AVG				AVG			AVG		
			73.6				35.3			23.7		
				Wicking ratio (Sample A/Sample B)			2.1	(Sample A/Sample C)		3.1		

It is seen in Table 9 and **Figures 20-22** that the 3 samples respectively had average or median pore sizes of 74, 35 and 24 microns. Using the Laplace equation, the relative driving forces (Delta P) for 25% and 50% microfiber were 2 to 3 times greater than the control: (74/35 = 2), (74/24 = 3). The Bendtsen smoothness data (discussed below) imply more intimate contact with the surface while the higher driving force from the smaller pores indicate greater ability to pick up small droplets remaining on the surface. An advantage that cellulose has over other polymeric surfaces such as nylon, polyester and polyolefins is the higher surface energy of cellulose which attracts and wicks liquid residue away from lower energy surfaces such as glass, metals and so forth.

For purposes of convenience, we refer to the relative wicking ratio of a microfiber containing sheet as the ratio of the average pore effective sizes of a like sheet without microfiber to a sheet containing microfiber. Thus, the Sample B and C sheets had relative wicking ratios of approximately 2 and 3 as compared with the control Sample A. While the wicking ratio readily differentiates single ply CWP sheet made with cmf from a single ply sheet made with NBSK alone, perhaps more universal indicators of differences achieved with cmf fiber are high differential pore volumes at small pore radius (less than 10-15 microns) as well as high capillary pressures at low saturation as is seen with two-ply wipers and handsheets.

Following generally the procedures noted above, a series of two-ply CWP sheets were prepared and tested for porosity. Sample D was a control, prepared with NBSK fiber and without cmf, Sample E was a two-ply sheet with 75% by weight NBSK fiber and 25% by weight cmf and Sample F was a two-ply sheet with 50% by weight NBSK fiber and 50% by weight cmf. Results appear in Table 10 and are presented graphically in **Figure 23**.

Table 10 – Two-Ply Sheet Porosity Data

Pore Radius, micron	Capillary Pressure, mmH_2O	Cumulative (Cumul.) Pore Volume Sample D, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample D, %	Pore Radius, micron	Pore Volume Sample D, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample E, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample E, %	Pore Volume Sample E, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample F, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample F, %	Pore Volume Sample F, $mm^3/(um*g)$
500	12	11.700	100.0	400.0	12.424	11.238	100.0	14.284	13.103	100.0	12.982
300	20	9.216	78.8	250.0	8.925	8.381	74.6	9.509	10.507	80.2	14.169
200	31	8.323	71.1	187.5	11.348	7.430	66.1	12.618	9.090	69.4	23.661
175	35	8.039	68.7	162.5	14.277	7.115	63.3	12.712	8.498	64.9	27.530
150	41	7.683	65.7	137.5	15.882	6.797	60.5	14.177	7.810	59.6	23.595
125	49	7.285	62.3	117.5	20.162	6.443	57.3	18.255	7.220	55.1	47.483
110	56	6.983	59.7	105.0	22.837	6.169	54.9	18.097	6.508	49.7	34.959
100	61	6.755	57.7	95.0	26.375	5.988	53.3	24.786	6.158	47.0	35.689
90	68	6.491	55.5	85.0	36.970	5.740	51.1	29.910	5.801	44.3	41.290
80	77	6.121	52.3	75.0	57.163	5.441	48.4	33.283	5.389	41.1	50.305
70	88	5.550	47.4	65.0	88.817	5.108	45.5	45.327	4.885	37.3	70.417
60	102	4.661	39.8	55.0	87.965	4.655	41.4	55.496	4.181	31.9	64.844
50	123	3.782	32.3	47.5	93.089	4.100	36.5	69.973	3.533	27.0	57.847
45	136	3.316	28.3	42.5	90.684	3.750	33.4	73.408	3.244	24.8	70.549
40	153	2.863	24.5	37.5	71.681	3.383	30.1	60.294	2.891	22.1	61.640
35	175	2.504	21.4	32.5	69.949	3.081	27.4	64.984	2.583	19.7	60.308
30	204	2.155	18.4	27.5	76.827	2.756	24.5	90.473	2.281	17.4	62.847
25	245	1.771	15.1	22.5	85.277	2.304	20.5	119.637	1.967	15.0	57.132
20	306	1.344	11.5	18.8	83.511	1.706	15.2	110.051	1.681	12.8	56.795
17.5	350	1.135	9.7	16.3	83.947	1.431	12.7	89.091	1.539	11.8	62.253

Table 10 – Two-Ply Sheet Porosity Data (cont'd)

Pore Radius, micron	Capillary Pressure, mmH_2O	Cumulative (Cumul.) Pore Volume Sample D, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample D, %	Pore Radius, micron	Pore Volume Sample D, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample E, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample E, %	Pore Volume Sample E, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample F, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample F, %	Pore Volume Sample F, $mm^3/(um*g)$
15	408	0.926	7.9	13.8	73.671	1.208	10.8	63.423	1.384	10.6	62.246
12.5	490	0.741	6.3	11.3	72.491	1.049	9.3	59.424	1.228	9.4	65.881
10	613	0.560	4.8	9.5	74.455	0.901	8.0	63.786	1.063	8.1	61.996
9	681	0.486	4.2	8.5	68.267	0.837	7.5	66.147	1.001	7.6	69.368
8	766	0.417	3.6	7.5	66.399	0.771	6.9	73.443	0.932	7.1	70.425
7	875	0.351	3.0	6.5	64.570	0.698	6.2	82.791	0.861	6.6	79.545
6	1021	0.286	2.5	5.5	66.017	0.615	5.5	104.259	0.782	6.0	100.239
5	1225	0.220	1.9	4.5	70.058	0.510	4.5	119.491	0.682	5.2	122.674
4	1531	0.150	1.3	3.5	74.083	0.391	3.5	142.779	0.559	4.3	170.707
3	2042	0.076	0.7	2.5	63.471	0.248	2.2	150.017	0.388	3.0	220.828
2	3063	0.013	0.1	1.5	12.850	0.098	0.9	98.197	0.167	1.3	167.499
1	6125	0.000	0.0			0.000	0.0		0.000	0.0	

It is seen in Table 10 and **Figure 23** that the two-ply sheet structure somewhat masks the pore structure of individual sheets. Thus, for purposes of calculating wicking ratio, single plies should be used.

The porosity data for the cmf containing two-ply sheet is nevertheless unique in that a relatively large fraction of the pore volume is at smaller radii pores, below about 15 microns. Similar behavior is seen in handsheets, discussed below.

Following the procedures noted above, handsheets were prepared and tested for porosity. Sample G was a NBSK handsheet without cmf, Sample J was 100% cmf fiber handsheet and sample K was a handsheet with 50% cmf fiber and 50% NBSK Results appear in Table 11 and **Figures 24** and **25**.

Table 11 – Handsheet Porosity Data

Pore Radius, micron	Capillary Pressure, mmH_2O	Cumulative (Cumul.) Pore Volume Sample G, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample G, %	Pore Radius, micron	Pore Volume Sample G, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample J, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample J, %	Pore Volume Sample J, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample K, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample K, %	Pore Volume Sample K, $mm^3/(um*g)$
500	12.3	4.806	100.0	400.0	1.244	9.063	100.0	3.963	5.769	100.0	1.644
300	20.4	4.557	94.8	250.0	2.149	8.271	91.3	7.112	5.440	94.3	3.365
200	30.6	4.342	90.4	187.5	2.990	7.560	83.4	9.927	5.104	88.5	5.247
175	35	4.267	88.8	162.5	3.329	7.311	80.7	10.745	4.972	86.2	5.543
150	40.8	4.184	87.1	137.5	3.989	7.043	77.7	13.152	4.834	83.8	6.786
125	49	4.084	85.0	117.5	4.788	6.714	74.1	15.403	4.664	80.9	8.428
110	55.7	4.013	83.5	105.0	5.734	6.483	71.5	16.171	4.538	78.7	8.872
100	61.3	3.955	82.3	95.0	6.002	6.321	69.8	17.132	4.449	77.1	9.934
90	68.1	3.895	81.1	85.0	8.209	6.150	67.9	17.962	4.350	75.4	11.115
80	76.6	3.813	79.4	75.0	7.867	5.970	65.9	23.652	4.239	73.5	15.513
70	87.5	3.734	77.7	65.0	8.950	5.734	63.3	25.565	4.083	70.8	13.651
60	102.1	3.645	75.9	55.0	13.467	5.478	60.4	20.766	3.947	68.4	10.879
50	122.5	3.510	73.0	47.5	12.794	5.270	58.2	25.071	3.838	66.5	11.531
45	136.1	3.446	71.7	42.5	16.493	5.145	56.8	29.581	3.780	65.5	21.451
40	153.1	3.364	70.0	37.5	19.455	4.997	55.1	37.527	3.673	63.7	22.625
35	175	3.267	68.0	32.5	28.923	4.810	53.1	41.024	3.560	61.7	24.854
30	204.2	3.122	65.0	27.5	42.805	4.604	50.8	46.465	3.436	59.6	32.211
25	245	2.908	60.5	22.5	88.475	4.372	48.2	54.653	3.275	56.8	35.890
20	306.3	2.465	51.3	18.8	164.807	4.099	45.2	61.167	3.095	53.7	47.293
17.5	350	2.053	42.7	16.3	220.019	3.946	43.5	73.384	2.977	51.6	48.704

Table 11 – Handsheet Porosity Data (cont'd)

Pore Radius, micron	Capillary Pressure, mmH_2O	Cumulative (Cumul.) Pore Volume Sample G, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample G, %	Pore Radius, micron	Pore Volume Sample G, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample J, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample J, %	Pore Volume Sample J, $mm^3/(um*g)$	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample K, mm^3/mg	Cumul. Pore Volume Sample K, %	Pore Volume Sample K, $mm^3/(um*g)$
15	408.3	1.503	31.3	13.8	186.247	3.762	41.5	81.228	2.855	49.5	62.101
12.5	490	1.038	21.6	11.3	126.594	3.559	39.3	95.602	2.700	46.8	78.623
10	612.5	0.721	15.0	9.5	108.191	3.320	36.6	104.879	2.504	43.4	91.098
9	680.6	0.613	12.8	8.5	94.149	3.215	35.5	118.249	2.412	41.8	109.536
8	765.6	0.519	10.8	7.5	84.641	3.097	34.2	132.854	2.303	39.9	136.247
7	875	0.434	9.0	6.5	78.563	2.964	32.7	155.441	2.167	37.6	291.539
6	1020.8	0.356	7.4	5.5	79.416	2.809	31.0	242.823	1.875	32.5	250.346
5	1225	0.276	5.8	4.5	73.712	2.566	28.3	529.000	1.625	28.2	397.926
4	1531.3	0.203	4.2	3.5	78.563	2.037	22.5	562.411	1.227	21.3	459.953
3	2041.7	0.124	2.6	2.5	86.401	1.475	16.3	777.243	0.767	13.3	411.856
2	3062.5	0.038	0.8	1.5	37.683	0.697	7.7	697.454	0.355	6.2	355.034
1	6125	0.000	0.0			0.000	0.0		0.000	0.0	

Here again, it is seen that the sheets containing cmf had significantly more relative pore volume at small pore radii. The cmf-containing two-ply sheet had twice as much relative pore volume below 10-15 microns than the NBSK sheet; while the cmf and cmf-containing handsheets had 3-4 times the relative pore volume below about 10-15 microns than the handsheet without cmf.

Figure 26 is a plot of capillary pressure versus saturation (cumulative pore volume) for CWP sheets with and without cmf. Here it is seen that sheets with cellulose microfiber exhibit up to 5 times the capillary pressure at low saturation due to the large fraction of small pores.

Bendtsen Testing

1) Bendtsen Roughness and Relative Bendtsen Smoothness

The addition of regenerated cellulose microfiber to a papermaking furnish of conventional papermaking fibers provides remarkable smoothness to the surface of a sheet, a highly desirable feature in a wiper since this property promotes good surface-to-surface contact between the wiper and a substrate to be cleaned.

Bendtsen Roughness is one method by which to characterize the surface of a sheet. Generally, Bendtsen Roughness is measured by clamping the test piece between a flat glass plate and a circular metal land and measuring the rate of airflow between the paper and land, the air being supplied at a nominal pressure of 1.47 kPa. The measuring land has an internal diameter of 31.5 mm ± 0.2 mm. and a width of 150 μm ± 2μm. The pressure exerted on the test piece by the land is either 1 kg pressure or 5 kg pressure. A Bendtsen smoothness and porosity tester (9 code SE 114), equipped with air compressor, 1 kg test head, 4 kg weight and clean glass plate was obtained from L&W USA, Inc., 10 Madison Road, Fairfield, New Jersey 07004 and used in the tests which are described below. Tests were

conducted in accordance with ISO Test Method 8791-2 (1990).

Bendtsen Smoothness relative to a sheet without microfiber is calculated by dividing the Bendtsen Roughness of a sheet without microfiber by the Bendtsen Roughness of a like sheet with microfiber. Either like sides or both sides of the sheets may be used to calculate relative smoothness, depending upon the nature of the sheet. If both sides are used, it is referred to as an average value.

A series of handsheets were prepared with varying amounts of cmf and the conventional papermaking fibers listed in Table 12. The handsheets were prepared wherein one surface was plated and the other surface was exposed during the air-drying process. Both sides were tested for Bendtsen Roughness @ 1kg pressure and 5 kg pressure as noted above. Table 12 presents the average values of Bendtsen Roughness @ 1kg pressure and 5 kg pressure, as well as the relative Bendtsen Smoothness (average) as compared with cellulosic sheets made without regenerated cellulose microfiber.

WO 2009/038735

CA 02707515 2010-02-10

PCT/US2008/010840

Table 12 - Bendtsen Roughness and Relative Bendtsen Smoothness

Description	% cmf	Bendtsen Roughness Ave-1kg ml/min	Bendtsen Roughness Ave-5kg ml/min	Relative Bendtsen Smoothness (Avg) 1kg	Relative Bendtsen Smoothness (Avg) 5kg
0% cmf / 100 % NSK	0	762	372	1.00	1.00
20% cmf / 80 % NSK	20	382	174	2.00	2.14
50% cmf / 50 % NSK	50	363	141	2.10	2.63
100% cmf / 0 % NSK	100	277	104	--	--
0% cmf / 100 % SWK	0	1,348	692	1.00	1.00
20% cmf / 80 % SWK	20	590	263	2.29	2.63
50% cmf / 50 % SWK	50	471	191	2.86	3.62
100% cmf / 0 % SWK	100	277	104	--	--
0% cmf / 100 % Euc	0	667	316	1.00	1.00
20% cmf / 80 % Euc	20	378	171	1.76	1.85
50% cmf / 50 % Euc	50	314	128	2.13	2.46
100% cmf / 0 % Euc	100	277	104	--	--
0% cmf / 100 % SW BCTMP	0	2,630	1,507	1.00	1.00
20% cmf / 80 % SW BCTMP	20	947	424	2.78	3.55
50% cmf / 50 % SW BCTMP	50	704	262	3.74	5.76
100% cmf / 0 % SW BCTMP	100	277	104	--	--

5

Results also appear in **Figure 27** for Bendtsen Roughness @ 1 kg pressure. It is seen from the data in Table 10 and **Figure 27** that Bendtsen Roughness decreases in a synergistic fashion, especially at additions of fiber up to 50% or so. The relative smoothness of the sheets relative to a sheet without papermaking fiber ranged from about 1.7 up to about 6 in these tests.

Wiper Residue Testing

Utilizing generally the test procedure described in United States Patent No. 4,307,143 to *Meitner*, wipers were prepared and tested for their ability to remove residue from a substrate.

Water residue results were obtained using a Lucite slide 3.2 inches (8.1 cm) wide by 4 inches (10 cm) in length with a notched bottom adapted to receive a sample and slide along a 2 inch (5 cm) wide glass plate of 18 inches (46 cm) in length. In carrying out the test a 2.5 inch (6.4 cm) by 8 inch (20 cm) strip of towel to be tested was wrapped around the Lucite slide and taped in place. The top side of the sheet faces the glass for the test. Using a 0.5% solution of Congo Red water soluble indicator, from Fisher Scientific, the plate surface was wetted by pipetting 0.40 ml. drops at 2.5, 5, 7 inches (6.4, 13, 18 cm) from the end of the glass plate. A 500 gram weight was placed on top of the notched slide and it was then positioned at the end of the glass plate with the liquid drops. The slide plus the weight and sample was then pulled along the plate in a slow smooth, continuous motion until it is pulled off the end of the glass plate. The indicator solution remaining on the glass plate was then rinsed into a beaker using distilled water and diluted to 100 ml. in a volumetric flask. The residue was then determined by absorbance at 500nm using a Varian Cary 50 Conc UV-Vis Spectrophotometer.

Oil residue results were obtained using a Lucite slide 3.2 inches (8.1 cm) wide by 4 inches (10 cm) in length with a notched bottom adapted to receive a sample and slide along a 2 inch (5 cm) wide glass plate of 18 inches (46 cm) in length. In carrying out the test a 2.5 inch (6.4 cm) by 8 inch (20 cm) strip of towel to be tested was wrapped around the Lucite slide and taped in place. The top side of the sheet faces the glass for the test. Using a 0.5% solution of Dupont Oil Red B HF(from Pylam Products Company Inc) in Mazola corn oil, the plate surface was wetted by pipetting 0.15 ml. drops at 2.5, 5 inches (6.4, 13 cm) from the end of the glass plate. A 2000 gram weight was placed on top of the notched slide and it was then positioned at the end of the glass plate with the oil drops. The slide plus the weight and sample was then pulled along the plate in a slow smooth, continuous motion until it is pulled off the end of the glass plate. The oil solution remaining on the glass plate was then rinsed into a beaker using Hexane and diluted to 100 ml. in a volumetric flask. The residue was then determined by absorbance at 500nm using a Varian Cary 50 Conc UV-Vis Spectrophotometer.

Results appear in Tables 13, 14 and 15 below.

The CWP towel tested had a basis weight of about 24 lbs/3000 square feet ream (39 gsm), while the TAD towel was closer to about 30 lbs/ream (40 gsm). One of skill in the art will appreciate that the foregoing tests may be used to compare different basis weights by adjusting the amount of liquid to be wiped from the glass plate. It will also be appreciated that the test should be conducted such that the weight of liquid applied to the area to be wiped is much less than the weight of the wiper specimen actually tested (that portion of the specimen applied to the area to be wiped); preferably by a factor of 3 or more. Likewise, the length of the glass plate should be 3 or more times the corresponding dimension of the wiper to produce sufficient length to compare wiper performance. Under those conditions, one needs to specify the weight of liquid applied to the specimen and identify the liquid in order to compare performance.

Table 13 – Wiper Oil and Water Residue Results

Sample ID	Absorbance at 500nm	
	Water	Oil
Two-Ply CWP (Control)	0.0255	0.0538
Two-Ply CWP with 25% CMF	0.0074	0.0236
Two-Ply CWP with 50% CMF	0.0060	0.0279
2 Ply TAD	0.0141*	0.0679**

*Volume of indicator placed on glass plate was adjusted to 0.54 ml. because of sample basis weight.

**Volume of oil placed on glass plate was adjusted to 0.20 ml. because of sample basis weight.

Table 14 – Wiper Efficiency for Aqueous Residue

Sample ID	Water Residue Test				
	µL Residue	Solution Applied	Efficiency	g Residual	gsm
Two-Ply CWP (Control)	12.3	1200	0.98975	0.0123	0.529584
Two-Ply CWP with 25% CMF	3.5	1200	0.997083	0.0035	0.150695
Two-Ply CWP with 50% CMF	2.8	1200	0.997667	0.0028	0.120556
Two-Ply TAD	6.8	1620	0.995802	0.0068	0.292778

Table 15 – Wiper Efficiency for Oil

Sample ID	Oil Residue Test				
	µL Residue	Solution Applied	Efficiency	g Residual	gsm
Two-Ply CWP (Control)	51.3	300	0.829	0.0472	2.03
Two-Ply CWP with 25% CMF	22.8	300	0.924	0.0210	0.90
Two-Ply CWP with 50% CMF	26.9	300	0.910	0.0247	1.07
Two-Ply TAD	64.6	400	0.839	0.0594	2.56

The relative efficiency of a wiper is calculated by dividing one minus wiper efficiency of a wiper without cmf by one minus wiper efficiency with cmf and multiplying by 100%.

$$Relative\ Efficiency = \left(\frac{1 - E_{without\ cmf}}{1 - E_{with\ cmf}}\right) * 100\%$$

Applying this formula to the above data, it is seen the wipers have the relative efficiencies seen in Table 16 for CWP sheets.

Table 16 – Relative efficiency for CWP sheets

Sample ID	Relative Efficiency for Water (%)	Relative Efficiency for Oil (%)
Two-Ply CWP (Control)	100	100
Two-Ply CWP with 25% CMF	377	225
Two-Ply CWP with 50% CMF	471	190

In various products, sheets with more than 35%, more than 40% or more than 45%, 50 % or more by weight of any of the fibrillated cellulose microfiber specified herein may be used depending upon the intended properties desired. Generally, up to about 75% by weight regenerated cellulose microfiber is employed; although one may, for example, employ up to 90% or 95% by weight regenerated cellulose microfiber in some cases. A minimum amount of regenerated cellulose microfiber employed may be over 35% or 40% in any amount up to a suitable maximum, i.e., 35 + X(%) where X is any positive number up to 50 or up to 70, if so desired. The following exemplary composition ranges may be suitable for the absorbent sheet:

% Regenerated Cellulose Microfiber	% Pulp-Derived Papermaking Fiber
>35 up to 95	5 to less than 65
>40 up to 95	5 to less than 60
>35 up to 75	25 to less than 65
>40 up to 75	25 to less than 60
37.5 – 75	25 – 62.5
40 – 75	25 - 60

In some embodiments, the regenerated cellulose microfiber may be present from 10-75% as noted below; it being understood that the foregoing weight ranges may be substituted in any embodiment of the invention sheet if so desired.

There is thus provided in accordance with the invention a high efficiency disposable cellulosic wiper including from about 90% by weight to about 25% by weight pulp derived papermaking fiber having a characteristic scattering coefficient of less than 50 m^2/kg together with from about 10% to about 75% by weight fibrillated regenerated cellulosic microfiber having a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml. The microfiber is selected and present in amounts such that the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient of greater than 50 m^2/kg. In its

various embodiments the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient of greater than 60 m^2/kg, greater than 70 m^2/kg or more. Typically, the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient between 50 m^2/kg and 120 m^2/kg such as from about 60 m^2/kg to about 100 m^2/kg.

The fibrillated regenerated cellulosic microfiber may have a CSF value of less than 150 ml such as less than 100 ml, or less than 50 ml. CSF values of less than 25 ml or 0 ml are likewise suitable.

The wiper may have a basis weight of from about 5 lbs per 3000 square foot ream (2 gsm) to about 60 lbs per 3000 square foot ream (98 gsm). In many cases the wiper will have a basis weight of from about 15 lbs per 3000 square foot ream (6.8 gsm) to about 35 lbs per 3000 square foot ream (16 gsm) together with an absorbency of at least about 4 g/g. Absorbencies of at least about 4.5 g/g, 5 g/g, 7.5 g/g are readily achieved. Typical wiper products may have an absorbency of from about 6 g/g to about 9.5 g/g.

The cellulose microfiber employed in connection with the present invention may be prepared from a fiber spun from a cellulosic dope including cellulose dissolved in a tertiary amine N-oxide. Alternatively the cellulose microfiber is prepared from a fiber spun from a cellulosic dope including cellulose dissolved in an ionic liquid.

The high efficiency disposable wiper of the invention may have a breaking length from about 2 km to about 9 km in the MD and a breaking length of from about 400 m to about 3000 m in the CD. A wet/dry CD tensile ratio of between about 35% and 60% is desirable. A CD wet/dry tensile ratio of at least about 40% or at least about 45% is readily achieved. The wiper may include a dry strength resin such as carboxymethyl cellulose and a wet strength resin such as a polyamidamine-epihalohydrin resin. The high efficiency disposable wiper

generally has a CD break modulus of from about 50 g/in/% (20 g/cm/%) to about 400 g/in/% (157 g/cm/%) and a MD break modulus of from about 20 g/in/% (7.9 g/cm/%) to about 100 g/in/% (39.4 g/cm/%).

Various ratios of pulp derived papermaking fiber to cellulose microfiber may be employed. For example the wiper may include from about 80 weight percent to a 30 weight percent pulp derived papermaking fiber and from about 20 weight percent to about 70 weight percent cellulose microfiber. Suitable ratios also include from about 70 percent by weight papermaking fiber to about 35 percent by weight pulp derived papermaking fiber and from about 30 percent by weight to about 65 percent by weight cellulose microfiber. Likewise, 60 percent to 40 percent by weight pulp derived papermaking fiber may be used with 40 percent by weight to about 60 percent by weight cellulose microfiber. The microfiber is further characterized in some cases in that the fiber is 40 percent by weight finer than 14 mesh. In other cases the microfiber may be characterized in that at least 50, 60, 70 or 80 percent by weight of the fibrillated regenerated cellulose microfiber is finer than 14 mesh. *So also*, the microfiber may have a number average diameter of less than about 2 microns, suitably between about 0.1 and about 2 microns. Thus the regenerated cellulose microfiber may have a fiber count of greater than 50 million fibers/gram or greater than 400 million fibers/gram. A suitable regenerated cellulose microfiber has a weight average diameter of less than 2 microns, a weight average length of less than 500 microns, and a fiber count of greater than 400 million fibers/gram such as a weight average diameter of less than 1 micron, a weight average length of less than 400 microns and a fiber count of greater than 2 billion fibers/gram. In still other cases the regenerated cellulose microfiber has a weight average diameter of less than 0.5 microns, a weight average length of less than 300 microns and a fiber count of greater than 10 billion fibers/gram. In another embodiment, the fibrillated regenerated cellulose microfiber has a weight average diameter of less than 0.25 microns, a weight average length of less than 200 microns and a fiber count of

greater than 50 billion fibers/gram. Alternatively the fibrillated regenerated cellulose microfiber may have a fiber count of greater than 200 billion fibers/gram and/or a coarseness value of less than about 0.5 mg/100 m. A coarseness value for the regenerated cellulose microfiber may be from about 0.001 mg/100 m to about 0.2 mg/100 m.

The wipers of the invention may be prepared on conventional papermaking equipment if so desired. That is to say, a suitable fiber mixture is prepared in an aqueous furnish composition, the composition is deposited on a foraminous support and the sheet is dried. The aqueous furnish generally has a consistency of 5% or less; more typically 3% or less, such as 2% or less or 1% or less. The nascent web may be compactively dewatered on a papermaking felt and dried on a Yankee dryer or compactively dewatered and applied to a rotating cylinder and fabric creped therefrom. Drying techniques include any conventional drying techniques, such as throughdrying, impingement air drying, Yankee drying and so forth. The fiber mixture may include pulp derived papermaking fibers such as softwood Kraft and hardwood Kraft.

The wipers of the invention are used to clean substrates such as glass, metal, ceramic, countertop surfaces, appliance surfaces, floors and so forth. Generally speaking the wiper is effective to remove residue from a surface such that the surface has less than 1 g/m^2; suitably less than 0.5 g/m^2; still more suitably less 0.25 g/m^2 of residue and in most cases less than 0.1 g/m^2 of residue or less than 0.01 g/m^2 of residue. Still more preferably, the wipers will remove substantially all of the residue from a surface.

There is provided in a still further aspect of the invention a high efficiency disposable cellulosic wiper including from about 90 percent by weight to about 25 percent by weight pulp derived papermaking fiber and from about 10 percent by weight to about 75 percent by weight regenerated cellulosic microfiber having a

characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml wherein the microfiber is selected and present in amounts such that the wiper exhibits a relative wicking ratio of at least 1.5. A relative wicking ratio of at least about 2 or at least about 3 is desirable. Generally the wipers of the invention have a relative wicking ratio of about 1.5 to about 5 or 6 as compared with a like wiper prepared without microfiber.

Wipers of the invention also suitably exhibit an average effective pore radius of less than 50 microns such as less than 40 microns, less than 35 microns, or less than 30 microns. Generally the wiper exhibits an average effective pore radius of from about 15 microns to less than 50 microns.

In still another aspect of the invention there is provided a disposable cellulosic wiper as described herein and above wherein the wiper has a surface which exhibits a relative Bendtsen Smoothness @ 1 kg of at least 1.5 as compared with a like wiper prepared without microfiber. The relative Bendtsen Smoothness @ 1 kg is typically at least about 2, suitably at least about 2.5 and preferably 3 or more in many cases. Generally the relative Bendtsen Smoothness @ 1 kg is from about 1.5 to about 6 as compared with a like wiper prepared without microfiber. In many cases, the wiper will have a surface with a Bendtsen Roughness @ 1 kg of less than 400 ml/min. Less than 350 ml/min or less than 300 ml/min are desirable. In many cases a wiper surface will be provided having a Bendtsen Roughness @ 1 kg of from about 150 ml/min to about 500 ml/min.

A high efficiency disposable cellulosic wiper includes: (a) from about 90% by weight to about 25% by weight pulp-derived papermaking fiber; (b) from about 10% to about 75% by weight regenerated cellulosic microfiber having a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml, the microfiber being selected and present in amounts such that the wiper exhibits a relative water residue removal efficiency of at least 150% as compared with a like sheet without regenerated

cellulosic microfiber. The wiper may exhibit a relative water residue removal efficiency of at least 200% as compared with a like sheet without regenerated cellulosic microfiber ; or the wiper exhibits a relative water residue removal efficiency of at least 300% or 400% as compared with a like sheet without regenerated cellulosic microfiber. Relative water residue removal efficiencies of from 150% to about 1,000% as compared with a like sheet without regenerated cellulosic microfiber. Like efficiencies are seen with oil residue.

In still yet another aspect of the invention, a high efficiency disposable cellulosic wiper includes: (a) from about 90% by weight to about 25% by weight pulp-derived papermaking fiber; (b) from about 10% to about 75% by weight regenerated cellulosic microfiber having a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml, the microfiber being selected and present in amounts such that the wiper exhibits a Laplace pore volume fraction at pore sizes less than 15 microns of at least 1.5 times that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated cellulose microfiber. The wiper may exhibit a Laplace pore volume fraction at pore sizes less than 15 microns of at least twice, three times or more than that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated cellulose microfiber. Generally, a wiper suitably exhibits a Laplace pore volume fraction at pore sizes less than 15 microns from 1.5 to 5 times that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated cellulose microfiber.

Capillary pressure is also an indicative of the pore structure. Thus, a high efficiency disposable cellulosic wiper may exhibit a capillary pressure at 10% saturation by extrusion porisimetry of at least twice or three, four or five times that of a like sheet prepared without regenerated cellulose microfiber. Generally, a preferred wiper exhibits a capillary pressure at 10% saturation by extrusion porisimetry from about 2 to about 10 times that of a like sheet prepared without regenerated cellulose microfiber.

In view of the foregoing discussion, relevant knowledge in the art and references including co-pending applications discussed above in connection with the Background and Detailed Description, further description is deemed unnecessary.

WHAT IS CLAIMED IS:

1. A disposable cellulosic wiper comprising:

(a) 25% or more by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber having a characteristic scattering coefficient of less than 50 m^2/kg;

(b) up to 75% by weight of fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber finer than 14 mesh, having a number average diameter of less than 2 microns and a characteristic Canadian Standard Freeness (CSF) value of less than 175 ml, the microfiber being selected and present in amounts such that the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient of greater than 50 m^2/kg,

with the proviso that the wiper has more than 25% by weight of the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

2. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has 30% or more of the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

3. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient of greater than 60 m^2/kg.

4. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient of greater than 70 m^2/kg.

5. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient between 50 m^2/kg and 120 m^2/kg.

6. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient of from 60 m^2/kg to 100 m^2/kg.

7. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a CSF value of less than 150 ml.

8. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a CSF value of less than 100 ml.

9. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a CSF value of less than 50 ml.

10. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a CSF value of less than 25 ml.

11. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a CSF value of 0 ml.

12. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has a basis weight of from 5 lbs per 3,000 square foot ream (2 grams per square meter) to 60 lbs per 3,000 square foot ream (98 grams per square meter), and wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a weight average diameter of less than 2 microns and a weight average length of less than 500 microns.

13. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has a basis weight of from 15 lbs per 3,000 square foot ream (6.8 grams per square meter) to 35 lbs per 3,000 square foot ream (16 grams per square meter), and wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a weight average diameter of less than 1 micron and a weight average length of less than 400 microns.

14. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has an absorbency of at least 4 g/g.

15. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has an absorbency of at least 4.5 g/g.

16. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has an absorbency of at least 5 g/g.

17. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has an absorbency of at least 7.5 g/g.

18. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has an absorbency of from 6 g/g to 9.5 g/g.

19. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is prepared from fiber spun from a cellulosic dope comprising cellulose dissolved in a tertiary amine N-oxide, and wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a weight average diameter of less than 2 microns and a weight average length of less than 500 microns.

20. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is prepared from fiber spun from a cellulosic dope comprising cellulose dissolved in an ionic liquid, and wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a weight average diameter of less than 1 micron and a weight average length of less than 400 microns.

21. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has a dry machine direction (MD) breaking length of from 2 km to 9 km, and wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a weight average diameter of less than 2 microns and a weight average length of less than 500 microns.

22. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has a cross machine direction (CD) wet breaking length of from 400 m to 3000 m, and wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a weight average diameter of less than 1 micron and a weight average length of less than 400 microns.

23. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has a wet/dry CD tensile ratio of between 35% and 60%.

24. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has a wet/dry CD tensile ratio of at least 40%.

25. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has a wet/dry CD tensile ratio of at least 45%.

26. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper further comprises a dry strength resin.

27. The wiper according to Claim 26, wherein the dry strength resin is carboxylmethyl cellulose.

28. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper further comprises a wet strength resin.

29. The wiper according to Claim 28, wherein the wet strength resin is a polyamidamine-epihalohydrin resin.

30. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has a CD break modulus of from 50 g/3 in/% (20 g/3 cm/%) to 400 g/3 in/% (157 g/3 cm/%) .

31. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper has an MD break modulus of from 20 g/3 in/% (7.9 g/3 cm/%) to 100 g/3 in/% (39.4 g/3 cm/%) .

32. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper comprises from 80% by weight to 30% by weight pulp-derived papermaking fiber having a characteristic scattering coefficient of less than 50 m^2/kg and up to 70% by weight of fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a CSF value of less than 175 ml, the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber being selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient of greater than 50 m^2/kg.

33. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper comprises from 70% by weight to 35% by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber having a characteristic scattering coefficient of less than 50 m^2/kg and from 30% by weight to 65% by weight of fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a CSF value of less than 175 ml, the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber being selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient of greater than 50 m^2/kg, the

fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a weight average diameter of less than 2 microns and a weight average length of less than 500 microns.

34. The wiper according to Claim 1, wherein the wiper comprises from 60% by weight to 40% by weight pulp-derived papermaking fiber having a characteristic scattering coefficient of less than 50 m^2/kg and from 40% by weight to 60% by weight fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a CSF value of less than 175 ml, the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber being selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient of greater than 50 m^2/kg, the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a weight average diameter of less than 1 micron and a weight average length of less than 400 microns.

35. A disposable cellulosic wiper comprising:

(a) 25% or more by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber;

(b) up to 75% by weight of fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a characteristic CSF value less than 175 ml, the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber being further characterized in that 40% by weight thereof is finer than 14 mesh,

with the proviso that the wiper has more than 25% by weight of the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

36. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein at least 50% by weight of the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is (i) finer than 14 mesh, (ii) has a weight

average diameter of less than 2 microns, (iii) and has a weight average length of less than 500 microns.

37. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein at least 60% by weight of the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is finer than 14 mesh.

38. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein at least 70% by weight of the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is finer than 14 mesh.

39. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein at least 80% by weight of the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is finer than 14 mesh.

40. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a number average diameter of less than 2 microns.

41. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a number average diameter of from 0.1 to 2 microns.

42. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a fiber count greater than 50 million fibers/gram.

43. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has (i) a weight average diameter of less than 2 microns, (ii) a weight

average length of less than 500 microns, and (iii) a fiber count of greater than 400 million fibers/gram.

44. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has (i) a weight average diameter of less than 1 micron, (ii) a weight average length of less than 400 microns, and (iii) a fiber count of greater than 2 billion fibers/gram.

45. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has (i) a weight average diameter of less than 0.5 microns, (ii) a weight average length of less than 300 microns, and (iii) a fiber count of greater than 10 billion fibers/gram.

46. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has (i) a weight average diameter of less than 0.25 microns, (ii) a weight average length of less than 200 microns, and (iii) a fiber count of grater than 50 billion fibers/gram.

47. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a fiber count greater than 200 billion fibers/gram.

48. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a coarseness value of less than 0.5 mg/100 m.

49. The wiper according to Claim 35, wherein the fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber has a coarseness value of from 0.001 mg/100 m to 0.2 mg/100 m.

50. A method of cleaning residue from a surface, the method comprising:

(A) providing a disposable cellulosic wiper comprising (a) from 25% by weight to 90% by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber, and (b) from 10% to 75% by weight of fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber, the microfiber (i) being finer than 14 mesh, (ii) having a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml, (iii) having a number average diameter to less than 2 microns, and (iv) being selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a scattering coefficient of greater than 50 m^2/kg;

(B) applying the wiper, with a predetermined amount of pressure, to a residue-bearing surface; and

(C) wiping the surface with the applied wiper, while applying the predetermined amount of pressure, to remove the residue from the surface, such that the surface has less than 1 g/m^2 of residue after being wiped under the predetermined amount of pressure with the applied wiper .

51. The method of cleaning residue from a surface according to Claim 50, wherein the surface is glass.

52. The method of cleaning residue from a surface according to Claim 50, wherein the surface is metal.

53. The method of cleaning residue from a surface according to Claim 50, wherein the surface is ceramic.

54. The method of cleaning residue from a surface according to Claim 50, wherein the surface is a countertop surface.

55. The method of cleaning residue from a surface according to Claim 50, wherein the surface is an appliance surface.

56. The method of cleaning residue from a surface according to Claim 50, wherein the surface is a floor surface.

57. The method of cleaning residue from a surface according to Claim 50, wherein the surface has less than 0.5 g/m^2 of residue after being wiped with the applied wiper.

58. The method of cleaning residue from a surface according to Claim 50, wherein the surface has less than 0.25 g/m^2 of residue after being wiped with the applied wiper.

59. The method of cleaning residue from a surface according to Claim 50, wherein the surface has less than 0.1 g/m^2 of residue after being wiped with the applied wiper.

60. The method of cleaning residue from a surface according to Claim 50, wherein the surface has less than 0.01 g/m^2 of residue after being wiped with the applied wiper.

61. A disposable cellulosic wiper comprising:

(a) 25% or more by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber;

(b) up to 75% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber finer than 14 mesh, having a number average diameter of less than 2 microns and a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml,

the microfiber being selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a relative wicking ratio of at least 1.5,

with the proviso that the wiper has more than 25% by weight of the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

62. The wiper according to Claim 61, wherein the wiper exhibits a relative wicking ratio of at least 2.

63. The wiper according to Claim 61, wherein the wiper exhibits a relative wicking ratio of at least 3.

64. The wiper according to Claim 61, wherein the wiper exhibits a relative wicking ration of from 1.5 to 5.

65. The wiper according to Claim 61, wherein the wiper comprises from 75% by weight to 30% by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber and up to 70% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a CSF value of less than 175 ml.

66. The wiper according to Claim 61, wherein the wiper comprises from 70% by weight to 35% by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber and from 30% by weight to 65% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a CSF value of less than 175 ml.

67. The wiper according to Claim 61, wherein the wiper comprises from 60% by weight to 40% by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber and from 40% by weight to 60% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a CSF value of less than 175 ml.

68. The wiper according to Claim 61, wherein the wiper comprises kraft softwood fiber and fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

69. The wiper according to Claim 61, wherein the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is prepared from fiber spun from a cellulosic dope comprising cellulose dissolved in a tertiary amine N-oxide.

70. The wiper according to Claim 61, wherein the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is prepared from fiber spun from a cellulosic dope comprising cellulose dissolved in an ionic liquid.

71. A disposable cellulosic wiper comprising:

(a) 25% or more by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber;

(b) up to 75% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber finer than 14 mesh, having a number average diameter of less than 2 microns and a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml, the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber being selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits an average effective pore radius of less than 50 microns,

with the proviso that the wiper has more than 25% by weight of the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

72. The wiper according to Claim 71, wherein the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits an average effective pore radius of less than 40 microns.

73. The wiper according to Claim 71, wherein the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits an average effective pore radius of less than 35 microns.

74. The wiper according to Claim 71, wherein the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits an average effective pore radius of less than 30 microns.

75. The wiper according to Claim 71, wherein the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber is selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits an average effective pore radius of from 15 to less than 50 microns.

76. The wiper according to Claim 71, wherein the wiper comprises from 75% by weight to 30% by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber and up to 70% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a CSF value of less than 175 ml.

77. The wiper according to Claim 71, wherein the wiper comprises from 70% by weight to 35% by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber and from 30% by weight to 65% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a CSF value of less than 175 ml.

78. The wiper according to Claim 71, wherein the wiper comprises from 60% by weight to 40% by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber and from 40% by weight to 60% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a CSF value of less than 175 ml.

79. The wiper according to Claim 71, wherein the wiper contains kraft softwood fiber and fibrillated regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

80. A disposable cellulosic wiper comprising:

(a) 25% or more by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber;

(b) up to 75% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber finer than 14 mesh, having a number average diameter of less than 2 microns and a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml,

the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber being selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a Relative Bendtsen Smoothness at 1kg of pressure of at least 1.5 as compared with a like wiper prepared without microfiber,

with the proviso that the wiper has more than 25% by weight of the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

81. The wiper according to Claim 80, wherein the wiper exhibits a Relative Bendtsen Smoothness at 1 kg of pressure of at least 2 as compared with a like wiper prepared without microfiber.

82. The wiper according to Claim 80, wherein the wiper exhibits a Relative Bendtsen Smoothness at 1 kg of pressure of at least 2.5 as compared with a like wiper prepared without microfiber.

83. The wiper according to Claim 80, wherein the wiper exhibits a Relative Bendtsen Smoothness at 1 kg of pressure of at least 3 as compared with a like wiper prepared without microfiber.

84. The wiper according to Claim 80, wherein the wiper exhibits a Relative Bendtsen Smoothness at 1 kg of pressure from 1.5 to 6 as compared with a like wiper prepared without microfiber.

85. The wiper according to Claim 80, having a wiper surface exhibiting a Bendtsen Roughness at 1 kg of pressure of less than 400 ml/min.

86. The wiper according to Claim 80, having a wiper surface exhibiting a Bendtsen Roughness at 1 kg of pressure of less than 350 ml/min.

87. The wiper according to Claim 80, wherein a surface of the wiper exhibits a Bendtsen Roughness at 1 kg of pressure of less than 300 ml/min.

88. The wiper according to Claim 80, wherein a surface of the wiper exhibits a Bendtsen Roughness at 1 kg of pressure of 150 ml/min to 500 ml/min.

89. A disposable cellulosic wiper comprising:

(a) 25% or more by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber;

(b) up to 75% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber finer than 14 mesh, having a number average diameter of less than 2 microns and a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml,

the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber being selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a relative water residue removal efficiency of at least 150% as compared with a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber,

with the proviso that the wiper has more than 25% by weight of the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

90. The wiper according to Claim 89, wherein the wiper exhibits a relative water residue removal efficiency of at least 200% as compared with a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

91. The wiper according to Claim 89, wherein the wiper exhibits a relative water residue removal efficiency of at least 300% as compared with a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

92. The wiper according to Claim 89, wherein the wiper exhibits a relative water residue removal efficiency of at least 400% as compared with a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

93. The wiper according to Claim 89, wherein the wiper exhibits a relative water residue removal efficiency of from 150% to 1,000% as compared with a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

94. The wiper according to Claim 89, wherein the wiper comprises from less than 65% by weight to 30% by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber and from 35% by weight to 70% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a CSF value of less than 175 ml.

95. A disposable cellulosic wiper comprising:

(a) 25% or more by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber;

(b) up to 75% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber finer than 14 mesh, having a number average diameter of less than 2 microns and a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml,

the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber being selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a relative oil residue removal efficiency of at least 150% as compared with a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber,

with the proviso that the wiper has more than 25% by weight of the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

96. The wiper according to Claim 95, wherein the wiper exhibits a relative oil residue removal efficiency of at least 200% as compared with a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

97. The wiper according to Claim 95, wherein the wiper exhibits a relative oil residue removal efficiency of at least 300% as compared with a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

98. The wiper according to Claim 95, wherein the wiper exhibits a relative oil residue removal efficiency of at least 400% as compared with a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

99. The wiper according to Claim 95, wherein the wiper exhibits a relative oil residue removal efficiency of from 150% to 1,000% as compared with a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

100. The wiper according to Claim 95, wherein the wiper comprises from 80% by weight to 30% by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber and from 25% by weight to 70% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber having a CSF value of less than 175 ml.

101. A disposable cellulosic wiper comprising:

(a) 25% or more by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber;

(b) up to 75% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber finer than 14 mesh, having a number average diameter of less than 2 microns and a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml,

the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber being selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a Laplace pore volume fraction at pore sizes less than 15 microns of at least 1.5 times that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber,

with the proviso that the wiper has more than 25% by weight of the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

102. The wiper according to Claim 101, wherein the wiper exhibits a Laplace pore volume fraction at pore sizes less than 15 microns of at least twice that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

103. The wiper according to Claim 101, wherein the wiper exhibits a Laplace pore volume fraction at pore sizes less than 15 microns of at least three times that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

104. The wiper according to Claim 101, wherein the wiper exhibits a Laplace pore volume fraction at pore sizes less than 15 microns from 1.5 to 5 times that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

105. A disposable cellulosic wiper comprising:

(a) 25% or more by weight of pulp-derived papermaking fiber;

(b) up to 75% by weight of regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber finer than 14 mesh, having a number average diameter of less than 2 microns and a characteristic CSF value of less than 175 ml,

the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber being selected and present in an amount such that the wiper exhibits a capillary pressure at 10% saturation by extrusion porisimetry of at least twice that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber,

with the proviso that the wiper has more than 25% by weight of the regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

106. The wiper according to Claim 105, wherein the wiper exhibits a capillary pressure at 10% saturation by extrusion porisimetry from 2 to 10 times that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

107. The wiper according to Claim 105, wherein the wiper exhibits a capillary pressure at 10% saturation by extrusion porisimetry at least three times that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

108. The wiper according to Claim 105, wherein the wiper exhibits a capillary pressure at 10% saturation by extrusion porisimetry at least four times that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

109. The wiper according to Claim 105, wherein the wiper exhibits a capillary pressure at 10% saturation by extrusion porisimetry at least five times that of a like wiper prepared without regenerated independent cellulosic microfiber.

FIG. 1A
25% MICROFIBER, AIR SIDE



FIG. 1B
25% MICROFIBER, AIR SIDE



FIG. 2A
25% MICROFIBER, YANKEE SIDE



FIG. 2B
25% MICROFIBER, YANKEE SIDE



FIG. 3A
50% MICROFIBER, AIR SIDE



FIG. 3B
50% MICROFIBER, AIR SIDE



FIG. 4A
50% MICROFIBER, YANKEE SIDE



FIG. 4B
50% MICROFIBER, YANKEE SIDE



FIG. 5


PERCENT
100
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
SAMPLE #
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
<200 MESH
200 MESH
100 MESH
48 MESH
28 MESH
14 MESH

FIG. 6


FIBRILLATED LYOCELL
SAMPLE 17
SAMPLE 18
SAMPLE 19
SAMPLE 20
LENGTH, mm
0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
3.5
4.0
4.5
5.0
6.0
MASS PERCENT
5.0%
4.5%
4.0%
3.5%
3.0%
2.5%
2.0%
1.5%
1.0%
0.5%
0.0%

FIG. 7


SCATTERING COEFFICIENT, m²/kg
PERCENT, cmf
y=115.84x + 35.276
R²=0.9894
y=107.28x + 29.692
R²=0.9818
y=88.991x + 34.742
R²=0.9991
y=91.872x + 28.51
R²=0.9534
UNREFINED NBSK WITH SAMPLE 17 cmf
NBSK refined 1000 REVS WITH SAMPLE 17 cmf
100% cmf, SAMPLE 17
TYPICAL UNREFINED EUCALYPTUS
TYPICAL UNREFINED SBSK
UNREFINED NBSK WITH REFINED 6mm cmf
NBSK refined 1000 REVS WITH REFINED 6mm cmf

FIG. 8


SCATTERING COEFFICIENT, m²/kg
BREAKING LENGTH, km
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
y=-4.4649x + 64.306
R²=0.9929
y=-3.4582x + 54.601
R²=0.964
y=-2.0537x + 41.221
R²=0.9305
10% SAMPLE 17 cmf
10% REFINED 6mm cmf
100% NBSK
20% REFINED 6mm cmf
20% SAMPLE 17 cmf
20% REFINED 6mm cmf, CHEMISTRY
20% SAMPLE 17 cmf, CHEMISTRY
20% SAMPLE 17 cmf, UNREFINED PULP
20% SAMPLE 6mm cmf, UNREFINED PULP


y=0.0694x + 5E-06
R2=0.9929
y=0.0633x + 9E-06
R2=0.964
y=0.0498x + 7E-06
R2=0.9305
10% SAMPLE 17 cmf
10% REFINED BSKP 6mm cmf
100% NBSK
BREAKING LENGTH, km
RELATIVE BONDED AREA, %
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0%
10%
20%
30%
40%
50%
60%

FIG. 9

FIG. 10


55% W/D
50% W/D
45% W/D
40% W/D
35% W/D
30% W/D
25% W/D
20% W/D
80% NBSK, 20% cmf SAMPLE 17, DEBONDED
80% NBSK, 20% cmf SAMPLE 17
80% NBSK, 20% cmf (6mm), DEBONDED
80% NBSK, 20% cmf (6mm)
80% SBSK, 20% cmf
80% SBSK, 20% cmf, DEBONDED
SBSK
SBSK, DEBONDED
DRY BREAKING LENGTH, km
WET BREAKING LENGTH, km
1
2
3
4
5
6
0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
3.5

FIG. 11


TAPPI OPACITY
70
65
60
55
50
45
40
BREAKING LENGTH, km
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
NBSK
90% NBSK + 10% REFINED 6mm cmf
90% NBSK + 10% SAMPLE 17 cmf


NBSK
90% NBSK + 10% REFINED 6mm cmf
90% NBSK + 10% SAMPLE 17 cmf
80/20 6mm
80/20 SAMPLE 17 cmf
TAPPI OPACITY
80
75
70
65
60
55
50
45
40
FORMATION INDEX
110
105
100
95
90
85
80

FIG. 12

FIG. 13


UNREFINED SW
REFINED SW
UNREFINED SW + 20% cmf
REFINED SW + 20% cmf
OPACITY
65
60
55
50
45
40
35
30
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
3.5
BREAKING LENGTH, km

FIG. 14


100% NBSK, 0 REV
100% NBSK, 1000 REV
100% CMF
50/50, 0 REVS
50/50, 1000 REVS
y=-0.01389x + 3.1701
R2=0.4676
y=-0.0147x + 3.1057
R2=0.7971
y=-0.0175x + 2.5784
R2=0.639
y=-0.3404x + 3.7704
R2=0.8028
y=-0.0736x + 2.9307
R2=0.2537
BREAKING LENGTH, km
BULK, cc/g
0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
3.5
4.0
2.0
2.2
2.4
2.6
2.8
3.0
3.2
3.4
3.6
3.8
4.0


100% NBSK, 0 REV
100% NBSK, 1000 REV
100% CMF
50/50, 0 REVS
50/50, 1000 REVS
y=-2.2169x + 90.298
R2=0.8563
y=-2.6113x + 82.818
R2=0.5802
y=-1.977x + 56.76
R2=0.4458
y=-4.3034x + 57.325
R2=0.9878
OPACITY
BREAKING LENGTH, km
100
90
80
70
60
50
40
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0

FIG. 15


100% NBSK, 0 REV
100% NBSK, 1000 REV
100% CMF
y=-22.768x + 176.65
R2=0.8636
y=-2.6287x + 38.82
R2=0.4952
y=-4.2704x + 38.191
R2=0.8908
BREAKING LENGTH, km
SCATTERING COEFFICIENT, m2/kg
0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
3.5
4.0
0
20
40
60
80
100
120
140
160
180
200

FIG. 16


WET/DRY %
70%
60%
50%
40%
30%
20%
10%
0%
8/40 cmc/AMRES
4/20 cmc/AMRES
NO CHEMICAL
<-- DRY BREAKING LENGTH, m
<-- WET BREAKING LENGTH, m
WET/DRY, % -->
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
BREAKING LENGTH, m

FIG. 17

FIG. 18



FIG. 19



FIG. 20


CUMULATIVE PORE VOLUME
PORE VOLUME, %
PORE RADIUS, MICRONS
100
75
50
25
0
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350
400
450
500
50% CELLULOSE MICROFIBER/50% NORTHERN SOFTWOOD KRAFT
25% CELLULOSE MICROFIBER/75% NORTHERN SOFTWOOD KRAFT
100% NORTHERN SOFTWOOD KRAFT

FIG. 21


DIFFERENTIAL PORE VOLUME
PORE VOLUME, $mm^3/(g*\mu m)$
PORE RADIUS, MICRONS
100% NORTHERN SOFTWOOD KRAFT
25% CELLULOSE MICROFIBER/75% NORTHERN SOFTWOOD KRAFT
50% CELLULOSE MICROFIBER/50% NORTHERN SOFTWOOD KRAFT
0
100
200
300
400
0
10
20
30
40
50
60


AVERAGE PORE RADIUS, MICRON
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
PERCENT MICROFIBER
0
10
20
30
40
50
60

FIG. 22


2 PLY CWP (CONTROL)
2 PLY CWP WITH 25% cmf
2 PLY CWP WITH 50% cmf
PORE VOLUME, mm3/(g*µm)
PORE RADIUS, µm
0
50
100
150
200
250
300
350
400
450
500
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100

FIG. 23

FIG. 24


HAND SHEET WITH 100% cmf
HAND SHEET WITH 50% cmf
NBSK HAND SHEET (CONTROL)
PORE RADIUS, μm
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
PORE VOLUME, mm³/(g*μm)
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
700
800


HAND SHEET WITH 100% cmf
HAND SHEET WITH 50% cmf
NBSK HAND SHEET (CONTROL)
PORE VOLUME, mm^3/mg
PORE RADIUS, μm
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
50
100
150
200
250
300
350
400
450
500

FIG. 25

FIG. 26


CWP BASE SHEET (CONTROL)
CWP BASE SHEET WITH 25% cmf
CWP BASE SHEET WITH 50% cmf
SATURATION
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
CAPILLARY PRESSURE, mm H_2O (KPa)
0
500 (66.7)
1000 (133.3)
1500 (200.0)
2000 (266.6)
2500 (333.3)
3000 (400.0)
3500 (466.6)
4000 (533.3)
4500 (600.0)
5000 (666.6)
5500 (733.3)
6000 (799.9)

FIG. 27


SOFTWOOD BCTMP, 1 kg
SOUTHERN SOFTWOOD KRAFT, 1 kg
NORTHERN SOFTWOOD KRAFT, 1 kg
EUCALYPTUS KRAFT, 1 kg
PERCENT CRYSTALLINE CELLULOSE MICROFIBER
0
20
40
60
80
100
AVERAGE BENDTSEN ROUGHNESS 1kg, ml/min
300
250
200
150
100
50
0


WATER
OIL
2 PLY CWP (CONTROL)
2 PLY CWP WITH 25% cmf
2 PLY CWP WITH 50% cmf
2 PLY TAD
0.080
0.070
0.060
0.050
0.040
0.030
0.020
0.010
0.000
ABSORBANCE AT 500 nm

FIG. 28