



Review

Understanding and Mitigating Contaminant Exposure in Firefighting: Comprehensive Review of Firefighter PPE on Contamination, Health Risks, and Decontamination Methods

Yulin Wu , Mengying Zhang , Rui Li and Guowen Song *

Department of Apparel, Events, and Hospitality Management, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011, USA; yulinw@iastate.edu (Y.W.); mezhang@iastate.edu (M.Z.); ruili@iastate.edu (R.L.)

* Correspondence: gwsong@iastate.edu

Abstract

Firefighters are exposed to complex combustion products and to contaminants carried on personal protective equipment (PPE). Occupational exposure as a firefighter is classified as carcinogenic. This review summarizes the current evidence on exposure environments, routes of uptake, contamination and secondary exposure from PPE, and the effectiveness and limits of decontamination approaches. Across incident types, smoke composition varies with the fuels and combustion conditions, but fine and ultrafine particles and semi-volatile organic chemicals are common. Biomonitoring confirms uptake after incidents. Self-contained breathing apparatus reduces inhalation exposure during active suppression, yet exposures persist through dermal absorption at ensemble interfaces and post-incident tasks. Protective ensembles can retain soot-bound polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, additive chemicals, and metals; volatiles and particles resuspension in vehicles and stations can extend exposure. Studies show that on-scene preliminary exposure reduction and laundering can lower contaminant burdens on PPE; however, removal remains incomplete and decreases when cleaning is delayed or when gear is aged. Emerging evidence raises additional concern for per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances from foams and coating materials, with limited data on exposure metrics and removability. The field lacks standardized, realistic contamination platforms and a dose-based definition of clean PPE. Integrated intervention studies linking exposure, secondary exposure pathways, biomarkers, and decontamination methods are needed to set performance-based targets and evaluate emerging hazards.

Keywords: firefighters; fire smoke; occupational exposure; personal protective equipment; contamination; decontamination



Academic Editor: Guang Jia

Received: 26 December 2025

Revised: 3 February 2026

Accepted: 25 February 2026

Published: 3 March 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.

Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.

1. Introduction

Firefighting is an extremely risky occupation in which personnel repeatedly encounter high temperatures, intense physical demands, and smoke from combustion [1–4]. In the United States, approximately 1,115,000 firefighters, including 370,000 career and 745,000 volunteer firefighters, respond to an estimated 1.2 to 1.4 million fires annually, with structure fires accounting for 475,000 to 500,000 of these incidents [5,6]. In 2020, approximately 64,875 injuries were reported among US firefighters [7,8]. While acute hazards such as burns and heat stress are obvious, a central occupational health concern is the cumulative burden of smoke and chemical exposure across a career, including exposures that occur during fireground tasks such as fire attack and overhaul, and routine tasks such as equipment restoration, training, and station work [4].

Fire smoke is a dynamic, multi-phase mixture of gases and particles whose composition varies by fuel, combustion conditions, suppression tactics, and incident phase [9–13]. Across fire types, firefighters may encounter irritant and asphyxiant gases [14–16], particulate matter spanning ultrafine to coarse sizes [17–22], volatile organic compounds (VOCs, e.g., benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEXs)) [21,23–25], semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs, e.g., polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)) [17,26–29], metals [11,12,17,30,31], and additive-related chemicals released from modern materials [32–35]. These mixtures evolve across minutes to hours, and the dominant hazards can shift across fire growth, knockdown, and overhaul [27,36,37]. Additionally, hazards partition between gas and particle phases and then redistribute onto skin, textiles, and surfaces, contributing to secondary exposure [24,38–40].

Exposure pathways are correspondingly multi-route and extend beyond the fire-ground. Inhalation can dominate during suppression when respiratory protection is not used or is removed early [41,42], but dermal deposition and uptake can be substantial at interface regions and during high-contact tasks; exposure can continue during personal protective equipment (PPE) doffing and post-incident handling when contaminated gear releases vapors or resuspends particles in enclosed microenvironments (apparatus cabs, gear rooms) [24,38,43–46]. There is still no consensus across the literature on the dominant routes of uptake for key compound classes across tasks and phases, and many studies cannot fully disentangle fireground exposure from secondary pathways tied to contaminated PPE and station environments.

These exposure realities have clear implications for long-term health [47–49]. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classifies firefighters' occupational exposure as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1), citing sufficient evidence for mesothelioma and bladder cancer and limited evidence for several additional cancers [4]. Cancer has become a defining health issue for the fire service [3,29,48,50–55]. The International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) report highlights that in 2025, 79.4% of IAFF members honored at the IAFF Fallen Fire Fighter Memorial died of cancer (247 of 311) [56]. Although epidemiologic signals are increasingly strong, a persistent gap remains in the mechanistic linkage: connecting external exposure mixtures (which vary significantly by incident and task) to internal dose metrics and biomarkers in ways that support prevention, standards, and evaluation of interventions.

PPE is critical to risk reduction, yet the evidence base increasingly shows that turnout ensembles can also function as contaminant reservoirs [39,40,43,57–61]. Particle-bound chemicals and semi-volatile compounds can deposit on PPE outer shells [59,62,63], penetrate into seams and layers [64–66], and persist after incidents [67,68], creating opportunities for dermal contact [36,69–72], off-gassing and resuspension [24,38,43], and cross-contamination to vehicles and stations if decontamination is delayed or incomplete [44–46]. Current standards, such as NFPA 1851, provide operational guidance on cleaning frequency and processes, but the field still lacks a clinically grounded definition of “how clean is clean,” including health-based thresholds for acceptable post-cleaning residue across relevant chemical classes [43,73–76]. Progress is constrained by the absence of a widely adopted, systematic platform that can reproducibly generate representative smoke mixtures, contaminate full ensembles under realistic heat/moisture/compression situations, and evaluate both residue and secondary emission potential; as a result, decontamination research often remains limited, challenged by a narrow spectrum of target analytes and simplified contamination protocols.

Emerging contaminant classes further expand the scope of occupational health. Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), which have been historically used in aqueous film-forming foams and are present in some protective gear materials, differing from classic

smoke toxicants due to their environmental persistence, long biological half-lives, and complex toxicokinetics [77–79]. Evidence suggests multiple possible exposure sources (foam use, treated PPE materials, station dust, and contaminated gear) [32,80], but the literature still lacks robust source apportionment and longitudinal data on how aging processes (laundering, UV exposure, thermal cycling) change PFAS release and transport from PPE materials [81,82].

Figure 1 summarizes the exposure continuum discussed in this review: incident sources generate an airborne mixture; firefighters experience on-scene exposure through inhalation (self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) on/off), dermal deposition and uptake (especially at neck/hood, wrist, and other interfaces), and incidental ingestion; contaminants can then accumulate in PPE as a reservoir through deposition, sorption, and penetration; secondary pathways (off-gassing, resuspension during handling, and cross-contamination to apparatus, stations, and homes) can prolong exposure after the fireground.




Figure 1. Firefighter smoke exposure continuum.

The objective of this review is to synthesize current evidence on firefighter exposure environments across incident types and phases, exposure routes and internal dose assessment using biomarkers, PPE contamination mechanisms and secondary exposure pathways, and PPE decontamination methods, effectiveness metrics, and trade-offs with protective performance. We emphasize where knowledge is robust versus where it remains limited, with particular attention to methodological gaps, especially the need for standardized contamination simulation and evaluation tools, as well as for integrated study designs that connect air/skin/PPE measurements to biomarkers and health-relevant endpoints.

Review Questions and Approach

We focused this review on four questions: (1) How do exposure environments and dominant contaminant classes differ across structural, wildland, WUI, and vehicle/battery-involved incidents? (2) How do contaminants deposit, penetrate, persist, off-gas, and transfer from PPE, creating secondary exposure pathways after the fireground? (3) How effective are on-scene preliminary exposure reduction and laundering or specialized decontamination methods at reducing PPE contamination across contaminant classes and

gear layers? (4) What methodological gaps limit the development of dose-based cleaning criteria (i.e., “how clean is clean”) and the evaluation of emerging hazards?

This narrative review used a structured literature search of peer-reviewed publications in PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science, complemented by targeted Google Scholar searches and screening of reference lists. Search terms combined “firefighter” (and “firefighting”) with “PPE”, “turnout”, “wildland”, “WUI”, “contamination”, “decontamination”, “laundering”, “off-gassing”, “resuspension”, “PFAS”, “PAH”, “VOC”, “flame retardant”, “metal”, and “biomonitoring”. We prioritized studies published in the past 20 years and included earlier work when needed to explain mechanisms or standards. We included field exposure studies, laboratory simulations, and standards and government reports that provided quantitative measurements of airborne exposure, skin or PPE contamination, off-gassing/resuspension, biomonitoring, or decontamination performance. We excluded studies not directly related to firefighter smoke exposure or PPE contamination/decontamination, and studies focused only on thermal performance without chemical exposure outcomes.

2. Firefighters’ Exposure Environments

Firefighters operate in exposure environments that are chemically complex, physically dynamic, and strongly shaped by firefighting tactics. Fire smoke is a multi-phase mixture of gases and particles that evolves across minutes to hours as fuels change, ventilation shifts, and suppression actions alter temperature and oxygen supply [9–13]. In the same incident, the dominant hazards can range from acute asphyxiants and irritant gases (e.g., CO, aldehydes, acid gases) to particle-bound toxicants and semi-volatile organics that persist during overhaul and post-incident handling [14–20,83]. Crucially, exposure does not end when visible smoke clears. Contaminants partition onto soot, skin, and textiles, creating secondary pathways through off-gassing, particle resuspension, and cross-contamination to vehicles and stations [39,40,43–46,57,59–61,84]. The sections below synthesize what is known across incident types, summarize how exposure has been measured, and highlight where current methods limit inference and control design.

2.1. Firefighters’ Exposure Across Fire Incident Types

Structural fires typically involve a combination of natural and synthetic fuels from modern buildings and furnishings. Ventilation-limited burning can generate soot-rich smoke and elevated products of incomplete combustion, including VOCs and particle-bound PAHs [85–94]. However, dominant chemical classes and their concentrations can change rapidly across fire growth, knockdown, and overhaul, and spatial gradients can be dramatic in real structures [27,95]. A major operational consequence is that time-weighted averages or area samples can fail to represent the peaks and microenvironments that drive personal exposure and dermal loading.

Wildland and prescribed fire smoke is dominated by biomass combustion, with a broad mix of organic gases and particles that varies with fuel moisture, fire intensity, and the balance of flaming versus smoldering [17,42,96–100]. Compared with structural fires, exposures may be lower at any single moment but can be substantial in cumulative terms because wildland work involves long shifts, repeated days, and limited use of respiratory protection under high heat and workload [17,42,101,102]. A recurring finding is that respiratory protection is often constrained by heat burden and exertion, shifting emphasis toward exposure reduction through tactics, time activity management, and post-shift hygiene [103–106].

Beyond respiratory protection, wildland firefighters typically wear lightweight garments made from a single layer of flame-resistant woven fabric [107]. These NFPA 1977

certified garments are intended to provide limited protection from thermal or radiant heat while maintaining breathability during prolonged outdoor operations [108]. In contrast, structural firefighting turnout ensembles principally consist of a three-layer system (outer shell, moisture barrier, and thermal liner) that is standardized under NFPA 1971 [109]. Given these construction differences, single-layer wildland garments may provide a reduced barrier to particle penetration and to the transfer of sorbed semi-volatile combustion products to inner garments and skin, which can increase the potential for dermal contamination and uptake [57,66,110].

Vehicle fires introduce fuels that differ from those found in buildings, including gasoline/diesel, lubricants, plastics, foams, and wiring insulation. As a result, smoke can include VOCs such as benzene, polymer decomposition products (including nitriles in some cases), and metal-containing particles, alongside soot and PAHs [19,111–113]. Modern electric vehicles (EVs) further introduce high-energy-density lithium-ion battery systems, which fundamentally alter fire dynamics and emission characteristics. In addition to toxic gases, hydrocarbons, and particle emissions, the combustion of battery components, polymeric separators, electrolytes, and cathode materials contributes to more metal-containing aerosol emissions [12,114–116]. These scenarios may produce intense short-duration peaks that matter for acute dose but are easy to miss with coarse sampling windows. In addition, the growing presence of high-voltage battery systems may alter the chemical and metal profile of emissions during battery involvement; however, firefighter-focused exposure data in these scenarios remains limited [59,117].

Wildland–urban interface (WUI) fires combine biomass with residential and commercial materials, producing smoke that can change rapidly as the dominant fuel changes [118–122]. In practice, WUI smoke may include both biomass-derived products and combustion products from plastics, foams, treated wood, and household contents, increasing chemical diversity. Despite the importance of WUI fires, the inclusion of WUI by first responders and their exposure characterization remains relatively sparse, and many studies rely on broad indicators, such as bulk PM, that do not capture key aspects of mixture composition, phase partitioning, or persistence on PPE [119,120].

PPE use during WUI incidents can differ from both structural and wildland operations. In practice, firefighters may alternate between wildland clothing for line construction and structural turnout gear for structure defense or interior attack, sometimes within the same operational period [123]. Respiratory protection can also differ because sustained operations and high heat load can limit the feasibility of SCBA, while smoke may remain present for days [101,124]. As a result, WUI response can combine longer-duration exposure patterns typical of wildland deployments with the chemical diversity of structure and vehicle smoke, increasing the potential for PPE contamination and secondary exposure [118–122].

Live-fire training is a crucial and often underappreciated contributor to cumulative exposure and PPE loading, as it frequently involves repeated evolutions, variable ventilation, and the use of enclosed or semi-enclosed spaces [13,41,58,125–128]. Some studies used commercial wood boards to improve repeatability, but these packages may not accurately reflect the chemical makeup of contemporary home contents [13,127–129], while others created intense and sustained smoke conditions with complex furniture [36,130,131]. Training is also a setting where PPE may be used repeatedly before cleaning, which can increase cumulative PPE loading and post-training exposure [13,41,57,95,132]. A major barrier to data synthesis is that studies and training reports often lack detailed descriptions of fuels, ventilation, and tactics, limiting comparison across sites.

Figure 2 summarizes the reported total PAH concentrations across fire scenarios to illustrate the broad range of field measurements. It should be interpreted as a qualitative context rather than a definitive comparison, because studies differ in sampling location

(area vs. personal), phase definition, analytical panels, and averaging time. The figure also highlights a consistent gap that wildland and WUI fires are less well represented in PAH databases than in structural contexts.




Figure 2. Total PAH concentration in the field (unit: $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) [36,40,41,62,95,128,133–140].

2.2. Firefighters' Exposure to PFAS

PFAS are especially critical because they differ from many classic smoke toxicants in persistence, exposure pathways, and toxicokinetics. For firefighters, PFAS exposure can arise from combustion emissions, including the burning of PFAS-containing materials, and from non-combustion sources. Key occupational sources include firefighting foams, especially the historical use of aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF) at training sites and during some Class B fuel fires (e.g., aviation, industrial, and some vehicle incidents) [32,77,78,141]. Another source is the material and treatment of turnout gear. PFAS have been used as fluorinated polymers in membranes (e.g., ePTFE) and as durable water repellent textile treatments, while PFAS classes have been documented in turnout gear and related storage environments [142].

Empirical evidence indicates that PFAS are present in the firefighter exposure system beyond the fireground. Fire station dust studies measuring suites of PFAS show that station environments can act as reservoirs, consistent with the idea that gear, surfaces, and indoor microenvironments contribute to ongoing exposure [143]. Biomonitoring studies in multiple firefighter populations also report measurable serum PFAS and, in some cohorts, elevations related to reference populations, although patterns differ by department and context [144,145]. A recent review of the literature emphasizes multiple pathways (foam, gear, dust, and station practices) and highlights that PFAS exposure is likely occupationally relevant for firefighters, even as legacy PFAS are phased out [146].

PFAS also underscore an important methodological limitation. A substantial proportion of PFAS found in textiles occurs as polymeric materials or precursor compounds; therefore, analytical approaches that target only a limited set of commonly regulated PFAS are likely to underestimate the total fluorinated content [147]. Weathering and aging of treated textiles may further change the extractability of PFAS and the interaction with skin,

but systematic longitudinal studies of the effect of turnout gear aging on PFAS release are still limited [142,143].

2.3. Routes of Exposure of Firefighters

Inhalation remains central when respiratory protection is not used during wildland firefighting, is removed during overhaul, or is compromised by leakage at face–seal interfaces [17,26,42,83,101–103,148]. Accordingly, inhalation exposure is also important in WUI and vehicle incidents whenever respiratory protection is not worn continuously through suppression and post-suppression phases [19,83,103,111–116,118–122,148]. Overhaul studies demonstrate that hazardous compounds can persist after visible flames are controlled, and post-incident conditions can still produce meaningful inhalation exposure if protection is discontinued prematurely [83,103,148]. Inhalation exposure also extends to post-fire handling when contaminated PPE off-gasses VOCs or resuspends particles in enclosed spaces, such as apparatus cabs and gear storage areas [24,38,43,84,88].

A key shift in the recent literature is the growing evidence that dermal absorption contributes to internal dose even when SCBA is used [4,36,69–72,149]. Dermal loading is shaped by contaminant exposure (fire type, level, and firefighting) [36,59,69,138,149], PPE design (layers and interfaces) [18,84,110,150,151], elevated skin sweating and temperature [57,152], and contact transfer during PPE doffing and equipment handling [61,84]. Additionally, hands may become contaminated during activities such as crawling or removing gloves, with studies noting higher contamination levels on fingers compared to other body parts [57,153]. However, route attribution remains difficult because biomarkers integrate multi-route uptake and are sensitive to timing, metabolism, and background exposures [23,126]. The field needs more paired designs that measure air, skin, and PPE residue alongside biomarkers to support route-specific inference.

Ingestion has been less studied but is relevant through hand-to-mouth transfer and contaminated station dust, especially when contaminated surfaces are present in living quarters or vehicles [4,32,154]. This pathway is often overlooked, yet it may be crucial for chemical classes that persist in indoor dust, including PFAS, and for scenarios where hand hygiene and doffing practices are inconsistent.

Fire smoke exposure should be understood as a continuum that extends beyond active suppression to include transportation and storage phases, during which vehicles and station environments may become contaminated by residual fire smoke and soiled protective gear. There is still no consensus on the quantitative apportionment of inhalation, dermal, and ingestion contributions for major chemical classes across realistic scenarios. Without route apportionment, intervention design is partly empirical (e.g., clean the gear) rather than optimized (e.g., control dermal uptake at interfaces and PPE doffing).

2.4. Methods for Characterizing Exposure Environments

Exposure studies commonly combine real-time monitoring (e.g., CO and aerosol metrics) [14,36,112,131], integrated air sampling (filters and sorbents for VOCs/SVOCs and metals) [36,131,155,156], passive sampler [125,157–160], surface or skin wipes [161,162], and biomonitoring [163–165]. Each method answers different questions, and methodological choices strongly constrain what can be inferred about route and source. For example, real-time sensors capture peaks and task timing but provide limited chemical resolution [36,131]; targeted analytical panels provide compound specificity but cover only a fraction of the mixture [166–170]; wipe sampling is useful for assessing contact hazards but is sensitive to sampling technique and may not distinguish surface contamination from embedded residues [171,172]; biomonitoring (urinary metabolites, blood/serum measurements) directly addresses internal dose but biomarker kinetics vary across compounds,

baseline exposures vary across individuals and departments, and sampling timing strongly influences inference about route and source [173–175].

The dominant limitation is not the absence of measurement tools but the lack of integrated study designs that link external exposure metrics to PPE contamination and internal dose under realistic operational variability. Many datasets still average across phases or rely on single surrogates, which can obscure the drivers of exposure and weaken translation into controls [176]. A priority is to harmonize protocols that pair task/phase logging with synchronized air, skin, and PPE measurements and that report sufficient contextual detail (fuel, ventilation, suppression tactics) to support cross-study synthesis.

In addition, job assignment and rank can influence exposure because duties differ in proximity to smoke, time spent in contaminated zones, and frequency of direct contact with contaminated surfaces and PPE [27,176]. Internal dose metrics for PAHs and VOCs vary by job assignment, with higher levels generally observed among firefighters performing interior fire attack and search/rescue than among those more often assigned to exterior duties [27]. Non-suppression roles can still experience inhalation exposure when working in contaminated environments, as shown by measurements during post-fire investigations across hot, warm, and cold scenes [61]. Studies also showed higher PAH contamination on turnout jackets and on skin for fire attack and search roles compared with overhaul or exterior operators [57]. Hand contamination appears especially sensitive to high-contact tasks, and a study identified a diverse mixture of flame retardants and higher PAH residues on firefighters' hands during fire attack and search compared with other duties [177]. Rank often influences who performs these tasks, but exposure comparisons that explicitly include incident command and other command/support functions remain limited; this is an important gap in the current evidence base.

2.5. Research Platforms and Methods for Quantifying Firefighters' Exposure Environments

2.5.1. Field Deployment Studies in Real Incidents and Training Fires

Field studies provide the strongest external validity because they capture real fuels, dynamic ventilation, and authentic work practices. They established that exposure varies sharply by phase and task and that hazardous compounds can persist during structural fire overhaul and wildland fire mop-up phases [17,42,102,178–181]. Their limitations are equally important: sampling logistics often restrict personal monitoring, spatial gradients make area measurements hard to interpret, and the mixture differs across incidents in ways that are difficult to control. As a result, field data are essential but insufficient on their own for intervention testing and mechanistic inference.

Personal exposure monitoring can be one of the few approaches that can resolve the strong task- and phase-dependence of fireground exposure. Field studies typically integrate active air or passive samplers to quantify PM, aldehydes, VOCs, PAHs, and selected acid gases or metals. Active air samplers provide detailed inhalation exposure approximation using battery-powered pumps that draw air through filters to capture particulate matter, followed by chemical sorbents to collect specific compounds. However, these devices can be bulky, interfere with movement, and are prone to failure under extreme fire conditions, including high heat, moisture, and dense smoke [12,36,85,182]. Silicone passive samplers have recently attracted great attention for dermal exposure due to their unique advantages, including thermal stability, moisture resistance, mechanical durability, broad-spectrum chemical absorption, and ease of use in the field [35,72,183,184]. However, across fire types, personal monitoring still tends to be limited to a manageable panel of targets (CO, PM mass, selected VOCs/PAHs), while the broader mixture and transformation products remain under-characterized. Progress in this area will likely require study designs that explicitly

link personal air data to exposure environments and biomarkers so that exposure metrics can become actionable for control decisions.

2.5.2. Large Scale Exposure Simulators for Repeatability and Intervention Testing

Large-scale combustion simulators include burn rooms [36,131,185], containerized structures [25,41,130], instrumented training houses [128,158], mannequin trials [130], creating controlled conditions that improve repeatability and enable synchronized sampling of air, PPE, and biological endpoints. These platforms are valuable for comparing tactics or controls, such as SCBA usage, PPE contamination, or preliminary decontamination reduction. Their main limitations include relatively high variability, substantial cost and maintenance requirements, and potential environmental impact. In addition, many simulations cannot fully reproduce the coupled effects of complex fuel, humidity, and dynamically changing ventilation conditions characteristic of real fire incidents.

2.5.3. Lab-Based Small-Scale Combustion and Smoke Simulator

Bench-scale combustion systems including the cone calorimeter [186–190], tube-furnace systems [99,191,192], and other customized heating setups [30,193–195] are used to estimate fire behavior of fuel materials under tightly controlled conditions. When coupled with gas and particle sampling systems, the generated gaseous species, particulate matter, and selected toxicants can also be measured, thus enhancing understanding of the contribution of specific combustion conditions to emissions [196]. These methods are powerful for mechanistic studies and for screening changing material inventories, but they do not automatically reproduce the thermodynamic and fluid-dynamic complexity of fire scenes. In particular, oxygen limitation, water application, and turbulent mixing have a strong influence on smoke chemistry and particle properties, yet they are difficult to emulate in simple setups.

The cone calorimeter provides advantages in controlling combustion conditions and characterizing emissions in fire research. Its primary strength lies in the precise control of external heat flux, sample orientation, airflow, and the extensive function of oxygen supply, enabling reproducible ignition, burning rates, and heat release measurements under well-defined boundary conditions [186–188,197–199]. This level of control enables a systematic investigation of material-specific combustion behavior, allowing for direct comparisons across fuels, treatments, or aging states. In addition, the standardized configuration (e.g., ISO 5660 and ASTM E1354) supports inter-laboratory comparability and integration with established fire performance metrics [200,201], while the relatively small sample size reduces material requirements and experimental cost compared with large-scale fire tests. Recent research has increasingly employed cone calorimeters as part of integrated experimental frameworks, coupling controlled combustion with high resolution chemical analysis and modeling to better link laboratory results to real-world exposure scenarios [87,90,198,202,203].

Tube furnaces, such as the Purser furnace (ISO/TS 19700) can produce reproducible yields of toxic products at an even smaller scale [204–206], and some laboratory systems extend to smoke aging or transformation studies [99,191,192,207–209]. Tube furnace provides precise control of temperature, heating rate, residence time, and atmospheric composition (e.g., inert, oxidative, or fuel-rich environments). This level of control allows systematic isolation of specific thermal processes such as pyrolysis, smoldering, and well ventilated, which are difficult to achieve in open-flame or radiant heating systems [99,208]. In addition, the uniform temperature field and laminar flow conditions support reproducible emission factor measurements and facilitate integration with downstream gas and particle sampling systems. The controlled gas flow and defined residence times allow researchers to probe

the influence of oxygen concentration, humidity, and additives on emission composition with minimal confounding from fluctuating heat flux or turbulence.

Despite their advantages, these systems have several limitations, particularly in terms of emission representativeness, for smoke simulation. The imposed radiant heat flux and simplified ventilation do not fully replicate the complex, transient combustion environments encountered in real fires, where fuel geometry, mixed materials, oxygen availability, humidity, and dynamic ventilation strongly influence combustion efficiency and emission profiles. Scale effects are particularly relevant: small samples may not capture phenomena such as flame spread, melt dripping, secondary ignition, or interactions among multiple fuel components. As a result, emission factors and chemical speciation derived from bench scale experiments may exhibit substantial variability and limited representativeness when extrapolated to full-scale fire scenarios [36,87,90,131,202]. Without this bridge, it remains difficult to use controlled systems to predict field exposure or to set contamination targets for PPE decontamination and standards. Additionally, external sampling trains need to be coupled with these instruments that can introduce uncertainty and increase maintenance demands.

Contemporary studies increasingly integrate bench-scale experiments with open-flame tests and full-scale burns to bridge scales and improve relevance. These efforts seek to address a shared methodological limitation: the limited capacity of existing approaches to reproduce repeated exposure cycles and long-term aging processes that likely drive contaminant persistence on PPE and subsequent secondary exposure. Experimental frameworks that explicitly incorporate deposition, storage, sunlight and oxidative aging, repeated cleaning, and material degradation would more accurately reflect the cumulative exposure system experienced by firefighters.

2.6. Synthesis of Research Gaps and Priorities

Overall, the literature supports a clear conclusion that firefighter exposures arise from a dynamic mixture that changes by incident type, phase, and task, and that continues through secondary pathways after the fire [17,18,23,24,38,42,43,57,126]. Firefighters can also be exposed to diesel engine exhaust from fire apparatus during station operations, particularly in apparatus bays and adjacent living quarters [210]. At the same time, key gaps directly limit prevention and standards development. These include incomplete characterization of complex mixtures beyond routine target lists, limited data for WUI and emerging vehicle scenarios, weak route attribution without paired air-skin-PPE-biomarker designs, and a lack of standardized methods that allow cross-study comparison. In addition, evidence on contamination and decontamination of wildland PPE remains sparse, even though wildland and WUI work often involves long-duration exposure and repeated reuse of clothing before cleaning [18,39].

The most pressing methodological priorities are as follows: integrated field protocols with phase/task resolution; improved analytical strategies that combine non-targeted screening and mixture-oriented interpretation (e.g., chemical class level metrics or toxicity weighted metrics); the establishment of exposure platforms that explicitly link controlled smoke generation to firefighter exposure, PPE contamination, post-incident release, and internal dose in firefighters. These needs motivate the next sections on biomonitoring and PPE contamination, where the same measurement limitations reappear as barriers to mechanistic understanding and effective control. Overall, evidence supports multi-route exposure and persistent secondary pathways, but the wildland and WUI evidence base remains comparatively small.

3. Firefighter PPE Contamination

Firefighting PPE is designed primarily against thermal and physical hazards, but field and laboratory studies increasingly show that it also accumulates fireground contaminants and can transport them beyond the incident [57,211–217]. In practice, the ensemble does not only block hazards but also it collects smoke particles and semi-volatile chemicals on the surface and within the textile system [36,39,57–61,63,95,218], extending exposure beyond active suppression through dermal contact, inhalation of resuspensions, and cross contamination to vehicles, stations, and other indoor environments [20,37,43,154,219–221]. Particle deposition, sorption of semi-volatile organics, and penetration into seams and interfaces can each dominate under different conditions, and each one has different consequences for exposure and decontamination.

3.1. Contaminant Deposition, Sorption, and Penetration

Mechanistically, deposition and retention depend on the smoke environment and textile properties. Particle transport to fibers occurs through diffusion, interception, impaction, gravitational settling, and electrostatic attraction, producing strong size-dependence and sensitivity to air flow and surface structure [84,222–225]. Hazardous substances remaining on firefighter PPE following fire response are often in the form of particulate matter [28,36,57,59,61,131]. Particulate matter adhering to the surface is held in place by molecular-level forces. These adhesion forces include van der Waals forces, electrostatic forces (especially in non-conductive materials), chemical bonds, and the capillary action of moisture on the surface [84,226]. The strength of these forces is dependent on the particle size, the properties of the particle and the surface, the relative humidity of the air, and the length of time that the particle has resided on the surface [226–230]. Longer residence time on a surface may allow moisture to condense in small gaps between the particle and the surface, increasing the adhesion force. Even if this moisture is subsequently dried, crystallized impurities may remain, helping to “cement” the particle to the surface [226]. This indicates that the contaminant should be removed from the surface quickly before contamination dries on the protective gear and the adhesion force increases [57,226]. For fabric contamination, fiber crevice or an interstitial void between fibers and yarns are intended to provide a geometric bond with particles [84,231]. Penetration is often modeled using single fiber or static fabric with Reynolds-number-dependent transport assumptions [65,222,229,232]. The effect of particle size, fiber diameter, and ambient wind velocities has been investigated.

The outer shell is the first and most visibly contaminated surface among firefighter PPE components, where soot and condensed organic compounds deposit rapidly. Empirical studies consistently detect PAHs, heavy metals, and plasticizers on PPE after exposure and subsequent laundering processes, indicating strong retention and incomplete removal [43,57,63,76,233]. Some contaminants can even pass through the outer shell and into deeper parts of the garment system [63,150,153,218,234]. This matters because the contaminant residing position (surface vs. embedded vs. within interfaces) strongly affects whether it can be removed by routine laundering or if it requires more specialized approaches.

Deposition and retention are not only affected by concentration in smoke. Material properties such as fiber type, weave, and finishes [84,231,235] as well as environmental conditions like temperature, humidity, and ventilation impact the sorption and absorption [223,224,236,237]. However, these factors are rarely controlled or systematically varied in PPE studies. Much of the research still relies on retired or previously used gear with limited described exposure and laundering histories [153,238,239]. This makes it difficult to distinguish intrinsic contamination behavior from the accumulated history of the gear.

There is also strong spatial heterogeneity across the ensemble. Studies have found higher PAH and VOC concentration on the exterior than the inside. In addition, accessories and interfaces can behave differently. Gloves, hoods, and SCBA interface regions have been repeatedly identified as high-risk reservoirs, likely because they experience frequent contact and are harder to clean effectively due to the complex structure [63,131,153,177]. Di-(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP) and lead are also prominent on SCBA facepieces, hoods, and gloves [240,241]. In addition, previous findings indicated that PAHs were strongly size-dependent, which would influence the deposition of PAHs in different regions of the textile structure [242,243]. Therefore, different chemical classes may partition to different components depending on contact patterns, material chemistry, and geometry.

3.2. Contaminant Off-Gassing and Resuspension

Contaminants on or in PPE can be re-emitted during doffing, transport, storage, and routine handling, often after respiratory protection is removed [244–248]. Volatile chemicals can off-gas from contaminated PPE as they re-equilibrate to ambient conditions [24,38,57,249]. Non-volatile residues, including particles and plasticizers, can also re-enter the environment during handling [43,88,250]. Post-storage activities (e.g., donning or folding) can generate short-term spikes in PM₁₀ in the breathing zone, underscoring potential exposure risks even from stored gear [84,235,241]. Although off-gassing is sometimes treated as low priority because laundering is assumed to remove most contaminants, field studies suggest that PPE can remain contaminated and inadequately decontaminated in practice [76,239,251].

Non-volatile contaminants can also re-enter the breathing zone as particles when gear is handled. Particle resuspension depends on particle properties and environmental conditions [246–248,252] and is driven by the balance between the adhesion force (van der Waals, electrostatic, capillary) and detaching aerodynamic and contact forces. Because turnout ensembles are porous and layered, particles can be trapped, re-deposited, or released intermittently as the fabrics can flex and compress during donning, doffing, and transport. Studies have found that physical activity releases around 30% of the contaminants that resuspend to the air [245,246]. However, most resuspension knowledge comes from general aerosol and clothing-transport studies rather than firefighter-specific turnout systems, and emission factors for typical station activities remain poorly characterized.

Contamination also moves across hands, tools, cab interiors, lockers, fire stations, and even firefighters' homes through repeated contact and repeated resuspension [44,45,239,253,254]. Firefighters often store their PPE in closets, where unclean gear can equilibrate with the contaminants prevalent in the storage area. The use of household washing machines by some volunteer firefighters can be another cross-contamination mechanism that can move residues into domestic environments.

Aging and delayed cleaning likely modify these secondary pathways by strengthening particle–textile adhesion and by changing sorption and diffusion in textile systems through repeated heat and moisture cycles, abrasion, and laundering [73,255–257]. These service life effects and the lack of longitudinal evidence tracking the same gear across repeated exposure-cleaning cycles are discussed in Section 4.3.

These pathways remain difficult to quantify because standardized methods for generating repeatable soot-bound contamination and measuring time-resolved emissions under realistic storage and handling conditions are still limited; this methodological gap is revisited in Section 4.6.

3.3. Contamination Simulation and Studies

3.3.1. Methods to Simulate and Characterize PPE Contamination

Because real incident exposure is variable and hard to reproduce, contamination simulation has become central to PPE research, especially when the goal is to compare decontamination methods or materials. Existing simulation methods can be grouped along a spectrum from high realism/low control to high control/low realism.

From the realistic simulation perspective, some studies expose ensembles during live-fire training or controlled residential structure burns (with firefighters or instrumented mannequin dressed samples) [36,57,95,130,131]. Initial efforts by Intertek used a tube furnace with a set burning fuel to push smoke across a sample to simulate fabric contamination in the field. However, obtaining uniform and detectable forms of relevant contamination proved difficult using this approach [258]. Similarly, large-scale and small-scale contamination simulators were designed and engineered to mimic field fire contamination; however, efforts were unable to maintain sample integrity or attain consistent and repeatable contamination [259]. These designs preserve realistic smoke dynamics and tactical effects but often suffer from limited repeatability. For example, even when the room setup is similar, variation in burning behavior and ventilation produces large fluctuations in key contaminants such as PAHs and benzene. Though it has been shown that identical production of contaminants from combustions may be impossible, controlled combustion that generates similar contaminants to a certain level is achievable [99,208,260–262]. Recently, research has explored different set ups to control combustion and yet achieve a level of consistent fabric contamination [28,263].

Different combustion and exposure conditions of these studies prevent cross-comparison of results. This is troubling, as studies on fire and material degradation have shown fuel composition as well as combustion conditions have a significant effect on smoke product composition [119,264–267]. To simulate fireground smoke in reality, several representative combustible materials need to be burned simultaneously to generate the desired types and amounts of contaminants. The amount, size, and composition of contaminants such as PM, PAHs, and VOCs are known to be affected by combustion conditions (e.g., heat load, gas feeding rate, combustion product gas recirculation, combustion time, etc.) and fuel properties (material composition, shape, size, amount, etc.) with different characterizing periods [87,90,260,261,268–270]. More specifically, in simulated wood fires, the variation of the flame temperature from 500 °C to 800 °C has been shown to result in a reduction in average PM size from 600 nm to 100 nm and an increase in PAH ring structure complexity [99,208,269]. In the pyrolysis and gasification fields of study, it is well understood that the reduction of oxygen availability results in the production of more complex VOCs [268,271]. Building fire conditions are often oxygen-starved due to limited ventilation and abundant exhaust gas recirculation, which has not been considered in the combustion simulator experiments to date. Taken together, this information suggests that PAHs, VOCs, and PM loads produced by combustion simulators may not be representative of actual fire conditions, and as a result, PPE material contamination levels or cleaning procedures evaluated through such methods may not be effective.

From the simulation control perspective, the conventional approach in NFPA standards-driven decontamination efficacy testing is physical/chemical doping of fabric swatches by misting or dripping known quantities of selected compounds to create a consistent initial contamination load [73,272,273]. This approach enables repeatable comparisons across detergents, washing cycles, and washing technologies. However, pure chemical dosage is fundamentally different from real fire smoke contamination: it does not reproduce particle-mediated sorption, heat- and moisture-driven diffusion into multilayer systems, or the dynamic deposition process under steep thermal gradients [13,36,84,131,239]. Fur-

thermore, PPE contamination will accumulate with long-term, repeated use, and smoke exposure, even with regular cleaning [153,238,239,274,275]. The current standard also focuses only on outer-shell contamination, while penetration through three layers and transfer through ensemble interfaces are often neglected [177,218,276]. Additionally, different types of contaminants like heavy metals and SVOCs can only be evaluated separately on independent samples due to their different sample preparation procedures. This kind of test may neglect the interaction between different types of contaminants as in real-world usage. For example, in most cases, SVOCs may transfer to small particles or remain within larger particles, which can result in heavier adhesion, mitigation, or cross-contamination of contaminants [95,179,277].

Between these perspectives are combustion furnaces and smoke-exposure simulators that generate smoke and transport it across fabric samples or ensembles. Early furnace-based approaches (e.g., tube-furnace smoke pushed across samples) struggled to achieve complex fire geometry and analytically detectable contamination for fabric or even products [99,208]. Larger contamination simulators designed to mimic field exposure have also faced reproducibility challenges, and in some cases the emitted particle size distribution and chemical composition were not fully characterized, limiting confidence that the simulated smoke represents firefighter-relevant conditions [28,130]. Even more advanced mannequin-based simulations improve realism but still show substantial variability in major contaminants [130,263].

3.3.2. Methods to Characterize Contaminant Deposition and Penetration

The most common methods to characterize contaminant deposition and penetration include surface wipe sampling (fast and field-friendly but partial and operator-dependent), destructive fabric sampling/extraction (more complete but sacrifices the sample and is difficult to scale to many gear components), and comparisons across layers (outer shell vs. moisture barrier vs. thermal liner) to infer penetration [36,57,63,172,239,263,278]. Quantitative methods for measuring deposited particle mass within fibrous structures remain limited, and many studies rely on indirect indicators such as deposition loss coefficients derived from particle counts near a surface [224]. These approaches are valuable for isolating transport physics, but they do not directly reproduce the coupled conditions of fireground exposure (high heat flux, moisture, soot chemistry, compression at interfaces, and repeated contamination cycles).

Evidence is strongest for detection of soot, PAHs, VOCs/SVOCs, metals, and additive related chemicals on PPE after incidents and training exercises, and for the conclusion that routine cleaning reduces but does not eliminate many contaminants [36,39,57–61,63,67,76,95]. Evidence is emerging for quantifying time-resolved off-gassing, particle resuspension, and cross-contamination during transport and storage, and for understanding how repeated exposure-cleaning cycles and gear aging modify these processes [24,33,38,43–46,238,239].

Collectively, these findings show that PPE can function as a dynamic contaminant reservoir, and standardized platforms are needed to compare studies and to support performance-based decontamination guidance. The central methodological gap is the absence of a standardized, mechanism-oriented contamination platform that links (i) realistic smoke generation, (ii) controlled exposure of textiles or full ensembles (including interfaces), (iii) quantified penetration into layers, and (iv) downstream processes relevant to secondary exposure. Without such a tool, contamination mechanisms remain only partially understood, and decontamination development becomes largely empirical rather than mechanistically targeted.

4. Firefighter PPE Decontamination

Exposure can persist after firefighters leave the fireground, as many smoke constituents readily partition onto soot and textiles. Contaminated gear can lead to continued exposure during doffing, transport, storage, and reuse through dermal contact, inhalation of off-gassed vapors, particle resuspension, and transfer to vehicles and stations. Decontamination therefore serves two coupled objectives: reducing the wearer's exposure (inhalation and dermal) and limiting contamination of shared environments. These goals must be balanced against PPE durability and protective performance, because the cleaning approach can potentially damage moisture barriers, seam tapes, and water/oil repellency treatment, while insufficient cleaning allows contaminant accumulation that may also degrade performance over time [28,57,76,89,255,263,273].

A central reason for PPE decontamination remaining difficult is that contamination is complex, multidimensional, and changes with time. As shown in Figure 3, combustion products accumulate in at least three distinct compartments: (i) surface-accessible residue (loosely adhered soot and condensed organics), (ii) near-surface and pore-scale contamination (particles and SVOCs retained in yarn interstices and fabric roughness), and (iii) embedded contamination within multilayer assemblies and interfaces (SVOCs diffused into polymeric barriers, seam regions, closures, and compressed contact points). These compartments differ in how strongly contaminants are retained and how easily they can be mobilized by water, detergents, solvents, or mechanical agitation. As a result, cleaning effectiveness depends not only on the cleaning method but also on the initial contamination state, the time between exposure and cleaning, and whether assessment targets surface wipes, layer-resolved extraction, or secondary emission potential.




Figure 3. Particles interact with PPE fabric system.

This compartment perspective also clarifies why decontamination may appear successful by one metric but not another. A method that reduces wipeable surface PAHs may still leave an embedded fraction that later contributes to off-gassing or resuspension [38,43,60,263]. Conversely, methods that mobilize chemicals from deeper layers to the surface can produce apparent post-wash increases in some compounds even when the total contaminant mass has decreased, especially when sampling relies on surface wipes [57,63,76].

4.1. Decontamination Processes, Methods, and Issues

Decontamination is a staged exposure control system rather than a single wash. Preliminary exposure reduction (gross on-scene decontamination) aims to remove loosely adhered soot before it dries and becomes more strongly bound, thereby reducing subsequent transfer during doffing and transport [57,73,263]. Controlled transport and storage aim to prevent

transfer to vehicle cabs and stations through bagging, dedicated compartments, and separation of clean and dirty zones [279]. Machine laundering targets removal of both particulate matter and a portion of sorbed SVOCs and metals [63,73,76,273,280]. Specialized processes (e.g., alternative solvents, oxidative treatments, or disinfection protocols) may be used when standard laundering is insufficient, when contamination involves unusual agents, or when specific gear components (e.g., moisture barriers) exhibit persistent contaminant retention [73,281].

Across field and controlled studies, preliminary exposure reduction using water and surfactant generally reduces surface contamination relative to water-only or no cleaning [57,263,282,283]. However, this evidence is stronger for surface residues than for embedded contaminants, and many studies focus on a limited set of target analytes (often PAHs) [76]. Accordingly, existing evidence supports gross decontamination as a practical measure for reducing exposure; however, it remains unclear to what extent such practices mitigate subsequent inhalation and dermal exposure across realistic duty cycles, or whether they meaningfully alter long-term contaminant accumulation within multilayer PPE systems.

For washer-extractor-based laundering, the literature broadly supports partial removal of many combustion-related contaminants, but also shows substantial variability by compound class, gear component, and experimental design [28,57,63,284,285]. Hydrophobic and higher-molecular-weight SVOCs are often less responsive to standard aqueous laundering, with decontamination efficiency less than 30%, consistent with diffusion- and partition-limited removal from internal domains [273,286]. Metals present additional complexity because their chemical form (e.g., insoluble oxides versus particle-associated metals) may respond differently to detergents and water chemistry [240,280]. Therefore, cleaning efficiency should be studied as an outcome of the contaminant–textile system under specific thermal and mechanical conditions.

Most decontamination evidence focuses on structural turnout ensembles. There is little controlled evidence on the cleaning and decontamination of wildland protective clothing and accessories or on contamination transfer during long deployments. Access to laundry of wildland PPE can be limited at incidents, which can increase the residence time of smoke residues on fabrics and skin. Future work should quantify contaminant loading on wildland clothing, evaluate field-feasible cleaning options, and determine whether smoke-derived contaminants persist through typical laundering protocols [18,39,42].

Evidence for specialized technologies (e.g., liquid CO₂ and oxidative approaches) is emerging but not yet conclusive. Some studies report improved removal of selected SVOCs or better outcomes for specific layers, while others show comparable or lower performance than conventional laundering depending on the contamination challenge, analyte set, and system parameters [281,285,287]. At present, the conclusion is not that any advanced method is universally superior, but that method performance appears to be compound- and layer-specific, and robust head-to-head comparisons remain limited.

Table 1 presents a summary of current PPE cleaning efficiency evaluation studies under diverse conditions applying conventional laundering and liquid CO₂ cleaning. Existing studies evaluating PPE cleaning efficiency demonstrate that conventional laundering can substantially reduce smoke-derived contaminants, including some PAHs and flame retardants, but with highly variable performance across compounds, materials, and washing conditions. Reported reductions for total PAHs commonly range from approximately 50% to higher than 90%, with consistently higher removal efficiencies for low-molecular-weight compounds than for high-molecular-weight, more hydrophobic compounds, which often contain fine particles, persist in structures of the outer shell, moisture barriers, and thermal liners. Several studies also report unintended outcomes, including limited removal or even increased concentrations of certain additives (e.g., OPFRs or TDCPP), likely reflecting redistribution, transformation, or analytical artifacts. Washing temperature, detergent

formulation, agitation, and repeated cycles all influence efficacy, while aging and weathering of fabrics tend to reduce contaminant removability. However, these studies are not directly comparable because contamination can mean soot-bound smoke residues versus neat chemicals applied to textiles, and outcomes can be reported for full items versus single layers or swatches.

Table 1. Summary of firefighter PPE decontamination approach and efficacy studies.

Contamination Condition and Sample Preparation	Decontamination Method	PPE Item	Decontamination Efficacy (% Removal and Residual)	Ref.
Smoke exposure simulator (mannequin trial)	On-scene wet soap decontamination and machine laundering	Hood (knit and particulate blocking) and jacket	Laundering associated with increased PAH breakthrough and decreased benzene breakthrough	[182]
Live controlled residential structure fire	Front load washer without agitator, 55 min cycle, Arm and Hammer Plus OxiClean detergent	Hood	Total PAHs reduced by 75.5%; benzo[a]pyrene 81.6%; phenanthrene 34.8%. PBDEs increased by 98.9%; NPBFs increased by 240%; OPFRs reduced by 41.9%	[63]
Simulated wood frame residential structure fire with ceiling lining and furnishings	Gross on-scene decontamination	Jacket	BDE 47, BDE 99, and BDE 100 reduced by 82 to 97%. Limited or no removal for BDE 153 and TBBPA. TDCPP increased by 421%	[233]
Bench top combustion chamber; includes aging states	NFPA 1851 compliant washing using 60 L water, 40 g detergent, 45 rpm rotation, 20 min wash	Fabric swatches on ensembles	Total PAH removal ranged from 65% to 97% depending on aging condition	[28]
Live fire training enclosure simulator	Laboratory washer with 65 L water at 60 °C with non-phosphate detergent	Fabric swatches attached to ensembles; outer shell vs. membrane vs. thermal barrier	PAH reduction of 79 ± 14% for outer shell, 63 ± 25% for membrane, and 58 ± 14% for thermal barrier	[60]
Physical doping using 16 EPA PAHs	Washer extractor per NFPA 1851, industrial detergent containing D-limonene	Fabric swatches	Total PAH removal ranged from 20% to 50% at standard temperature and 50% to 80% at elevated temperature	[272]
Physical doping using 16 EPA PAHs	Bench scale shaker bath and full-scale washer extractor at 40 and 65 °C for 15 and 60 min using two detergents	Fabric swatches	Greater than 90% removal for phenol, approximately 80% for phenanthrene, 45% to 55% for pyrene, 15% to 25% for benzo[a]pyrene, and 10% to 20% for DEHP	[273]
Biological inoculation (Staphylococcus aureus)	ASTM E2274 washing followed by commercial washer	Outer shell fabric swatches	Ten seconds disinfection reduced bacterial viability by 73 to 100%. Commercial washer achieved 99.7% effectiveness	[288]
Physical doping using 16 EPA PAHs	Bench scale washing using water shaker with eight commercial detergents including charcoal based products at 0 to 50 mL	Fabric swatches	Low molecular weight PAHs reduced by 60 to 90%. High molecular weight PAHs reduced by 10 to 90% depending on detergent level	[286]
Physical doping using 10 NFPA 1851 compounds	Liquid CO ₂	Fabric swatches	Approximately 100% removal for tested NFPA compounds	[289]
Used and repeatedly contaminated ensembles	Liquid CO ₂ under 53 bar pressure	Full ensembles: outer shell, membrane, thermal liner	Total PAHs reduced to below detection limits in outer shell, membrane, and lining layers	[281]
Physical doping using 10 NFPA 1851 compounds	Liquid CO ₂ cleaning with 50 min cycle at 600 to 850 psi compared vs. conventional laundering	Fabric swatches	Conventional laundering removed 30.29% to 95.59%. Liquid CO ₂ removed 89.67% to 98.52% of target compounds	[285]

By contrast, CO₂-based cleaning approaches show markedly higher and more consistent removal efficiencies for a broad suite of NFPA 1851 target compounds, often achieving greater than 95% reduction [73]. However, the available evidence remains limited in scope, with relatively few studies examining used, repeatedly contaminated gear, and long-term material performance. Overall, the literature indicates that while conventional laundering is an effective and accessible mitigation strategy, it does not uniformly eliminate persistent contaminants, and advanced cleaning technologies may offer improved performance but require further evaluation under more realistic duty cycles and aging conditions.

4.2. Secondary Emissions and Cross-Contamination as Part of the Decontamination Problem

Secondary emissions and transfer should be treated as part of the decontamination problem. As discussed in Section 3.2, contaminated ensembles can off-gas VOCs and resuspend particles during doffing, transport, storage, and routine handling, often when respiratory protection is no longer worn [24,38,43,88,245,246,248]. Decontamination effectiveness should therefore be evaluated not only by the residual mass on textiles but also by the post-cleaning emission potential under realistic storage and handling scenarios.

Cross-contamination during laundering is another under-characterized mechanism. Washing contaminated PPE with other textiles can transfer chemicals within a load, and residues can persist in washers and drying environments [63,273]. Post-wash increases in selected compounds may reflect within load redistribution or mobilization from deeper layers to the sampled surface [63]. However, few studies track mass balance across laundering (wastewater, gear residues, transferred to other items, or retention in machine components), limiting inference about net removal versus net redistribution for specific chemical classes.

4.3. Aging, Repeated Contamination Cycles, and the Missing Longitudinal Evidence

Most decontamination studies have evaluated a single exposure followed by one cleaning event, whereas real PPE experiences repeated smoke exposures, heat and moisture cycles, mechanical abrasion, and periodic laundering over months to years. Aging can change both contamination and cleaning behavior through loss of repellency finishes, changes in fabric roughness, microcracking or chemical changes in membranes, and accumulation of residues in hard to clean interfaces [153,238,239,274,275]. These changes may alter the sorption capacity, diffusion rates, and adhesion forces, which in turn could change both of the off-gassing dynamics and resuspension potential. Yet, longitudinal evidence tracking the same gear across service life with repeated exposures and cleaning remains scarce. This is a major gap because it limits the ability to predict cumulative contamination to set realistic cleaning frequencies and to design methods that remain effective over the lifetime of the ensemble.

4.4. Effect of Decontamination on PPE Performance

Cleaning has measurable costs. The concern about firefighter PPE reduced performance only requires it to be advanced cleaned twice a year [73,213]. Repeated laundering can reduce water/oil repellency and may affect moisture barrier integrity, while harsh chemistries or high temperatures can accelerate material degradation [239,255,290,291]. At the same time, contamination itself may impair performance and increase thermal burden and odor. The literature therefore supports a performance-aware approach in which decontamination strategies are evaluated on joint outcomes: contaminant reduction, secondary emissions and transfer, and changes in protective performance.

A deeper limitation is that most standards and studies focus on percent removal of selected analytes, but health risk depends on dose. Without dose-linked targets, it remains unclear whether a given residue level is safe and acceptable, which compounds should drive decision-making, or how to compare alternative decontamination technologies. Progress

requires bridging three layers of evidence: residue on PPE, secondary emissions and transfer (off-gassing, resuspension, and cross-contamination), and internal dose biomarkers.

4.5. Cleaning Efficacy Definition: How Clean Is Clean?

Most studies quantify cleaning efficacy as percent reduction of selected target contaminants on PPE (often PAHs, and sometimes flame retardants, plasticizers, and/or metals), measured before and after a contamination step [282,285,292]. This approach is useful for comparing cleaning protocols, but it does not fully answer “how clean is clean” because it is sensitive to the starting contamination state, the sampling method (wipe vs. extraction, sampling location, layer sampled), and the compound set chosen for evaluation. In practice, a high percent removal can still leave a meaningful residual burden if the initial loading is high, and it may not capture whether the remaining residue is likely to transfer to the skin or re-enter the air during later handling.

Empirical studies, nonetheless, provide several consistent signals about the current cleaning efficacy. In a controlled residential fire study, field decontamination using dish soap, water, and scrubbing can reduce PAH contamination on turnout jackets by a median of 85% [57]. In the same study, VOC off-gassing increased immediately post-fire and then declined within tens of minutes regardless of field decontamination, which underscores that volatile vapors and particle-associated/semi-volatile contaminants respond to different processes and may require different evaluation endpoints [57]. By contrast, a pilot study of water-only decontamination after live, residential structure fires reported no apparent benefit and an overall 42% increase in measured PAHs; importantly, the authors noted that this may reflect disparate pre-/post-sampling sites, illustrating how measurement limitations can overwhelm true cleaning effects if sampling is not standardized [282]. Laundering studies generally show substantial but incomplete reduction of contaminants. For example, a hood cleaning study reported large decreases in PAHs (e.g., total PAHs reduced by ~75.5%) but also found that some flame-retardant classes did not decrease as expected (and some increased), raising the possibility of incomplete removal and/or redistribution during washing [63].

Technology-comparison studies further show that decontamination efficacy is not a single value for an ensemble; it depends strongly on where the contaminant resides. A 2021 study comparing multiple decontamination approaches on turnout materials reported that, for the outer layers, aqueous laundering produced ~60–63% PAH removal (depending on temperature), while adding ozone increased removal (e.g., ~84% with aqueous laundering + ozone) [292,293]. However, for the middle layers, most aqueous/oxidation approaches had low removal rate ($\leq$ ~24%), whereas liquid CO₂ achieved ~84% removal in the middle layers [292]. A controlled comparison of liquid CO₂ decontamination with conventional aqueous washing (uniform contamination; targeted compounds) reported higher average efficacy for liquid CO₂ (~95.36%) than conventional wash (~68.77%), while also emphasizing a key limitation: the test used liquid contamination and did not represent soot-bound contamination typical of fire smoke [285]. The selection of pure chemicals significantly impacts the interaction between the contaminants and the fabric. Additionally, the volatility and concentration of the chemicals applied need more justification to better represent the real fire smoke contamination scenario.

Across studies, several determinants repeatedly explain why cleaning efficacy varies and why defining satisfactory cleaning is difficult. Removal tends to decline as compounds become more hydrophobic (often proxied by *K_{ow}*) and as molecular weight increases (e.g., higher-ring PAHs, many phthalates) [285,286]. Particle-bound contaminants demand mechanical action (brushing/agitation) and may be protected by soot matrices [285]. Bench-scale experiments with surfactant-based and charcoal-based detergent products also

suggest that detergent dose can be a limiting factor for heavily contaminated gear; higher detergent concentrations can increase removal substantially in controlled protocols, while low concentrations remove far less of the high-molecular-weight fraction [286]. At the same time, evaluation frameworks based on a small target panel can miss compounds that are operationally persistent or toxicologically relevant; for example, critiques have been noted that the NFPA 1851 cleaning verification kit included contaminants that may not represent the full spectrum of persistent high-molecular-weight PAHs that drive concern in fire smoke contamination [73,273,285].

The new NFPA 1851 gives the baseline of 50% average removal of SVOCs and 70% average removal of each heavy metal for determining the efficacy of decontamination methods [73]. In addition to the US standards, European standards also provide guidance of limited doses of PAH requirement on skin and clothing, while the standard of the European chemical agency (ECHA) for individual PAHs has a maximum of 1 mg/kg, and the GS Mark regulated by German law for product safety uses 0.5 mg/kg for individual PAHs and a maximum of 10 mg/kg for all PAHs together on clothing [294]. In many studies, some contaminants such as benzo(a)pyrene (IARC group 1 carcinogen) exceeded the GS standard even after washing [76,273,284,292].

A persistent challenge is the lack of health-based residue thresholds that define satisfactory cleaning for turnout gear. In practice, standards and departmental procedures often rely on procedural compliance (when and how to clean) and on removal percentages for selected chemical panels. This approach is understandable given the mixture complexity of smoke, but it can lead to two problems. First, percent removal depends strongly on the starting contamination state and measurement method, limiting comparability. Second, meeting a removal target does not necessarily indicate that residual contamination is low enough to minimize dermal transfer, off-gassing, or resuspension during routine station activities.

Incident type also matters for defining clean. Structural fires can load PPE with PAHs, VOCs, and additive chemicals, while WUI fires can combine biomass-derived pollutants with combustion products from household and vehicle materials. Vehicle and battery-involved fires may add metals and inorganic residues from battery components and electrolytes that are not well captured by SVOC-centered target lists. These differences support incident-specific decontamination decision rules (e.g., enhanced isolation and cleaning, or retirement, after battery involvement) and motivate broader analyte panels in standards and research [12,114–122].

A dose-based definition of clean requires linking the residual contamination on PPE to incremental inhalation and dermal dose during storage, transport, doffing, and reuse. A practical framework can proceed in three steps: (1) select health-relevant mixture metrics (e.g., BaP-equivalents for PAH mixtures, total fluorine or precursor-inclusive metrics for PFAS, and total metal mass for metals); (2) define an acceptable incremental dose using biomonitoring reference values, biomonitoring equivalents, or benchmarking to general population biomonitoring distributions; and (3) translate this dose target to a residue threshold on PPE using exposure models for dermal transfer, off-gassing, and particle resuspension. Data remain insufficient to propose definitive thresholds for most contaminant classes, but this framework clarifies the measurements needed to connect residue, exposure, and risk in a performance-based standard.

A rigorous evidence base for decontamination should therefore integrate contaminant removal, post-cleaning emission/transfer potential, and PPE protective performance. At present, these endpoints are rarely evaluated together in the same study under realistic repeated-use conditions, which makes it difficult to propose optimized protocols that are both exposure-relevant and materials-compatible.

4.6. Methodological Gaps and Research Priorities for PPE Decontamination

Evidence from field studies and controlled protocols supports that preliminary exposure reduction and aqueous laundering can lower surface-accessible soot and many smoke-derived contaminants, but removal is variable and often incomplete, especially for hydrophobic and particle-associated compounds [57,63,76,272,273,284–286]. Evidence for alternative technologies (e.g., liquid CO₂ and oxidative treatments) is promising but still limited by small study numbers and by sparse validation under repeated-use, soot-bound contamination, and service-life aging conditions [281,285,292,293].

The most important research limitation is methodological: the field lacks a standardized, mechanism-oriented contamination and cleaning evaluation platform that reproduces realistic smoke deposition, quantifies penetration into multilayer systems and interfaces, and evaluates secondary processes (off-gassing, resuspension, transfer) after cleaning. Without such a tool, contamination mechanisms remain only partly understood and decontamination development remains largely empirical. This gap constrains cross-study synthesis, slows technology comparison, and makes it difficult to translate laboratory removal results into operational guidance.

Priority directions include the following: developing standardized contamination challenges that include soot matrices and realistic thermal/moisture conditions; adopting layer-resolved and interface-focused measurements; using mass-balance approaches during laundering to quantify removal versus redistribution; and conducting longitudinal studies that track contamination, cleaning efficacy, and performance changes over repeated cycles. Finally, connecting residual contamination metrics to exposure-relevant endpoints, such as dermal transfer potential and biomarker-based dose measures, would provide a more defensible basis for defining “effective decontamination” than percent removal of a small analyte panel. These priorities should also be extended to wildland and WUI PPE, where operational constraints and material differences may change both contamination and cleaning requirements.

5. Health Outcome and Biological Evidence Associated with Firefighting Smoke Exposure

Firefighting smoke exposure occurs as part of a broader occupational mixture that includes combustion products, heat stress, intense physical exertion, and additional non-smoke hazards (e.g., diesel exhaust and, for many departments, PFAS from foams and treated materials) [4,17,42,184,295]. The strongest evidence comes from cancer epidemiology and authoritative hazard evaluations, while evidence for non-cancer outcomes is supported mainly by acute physiological studies and shorter-term biomonitoring that capture internal dose and early biological effects but do not yet provide robust exposure–response functions for long-latency disease [4,296].

5.1. Cancer and Long-Latency Outcomes

The most policy-relevant conclusion in the field is the IARC evaluation that occupational exposure as a firefighter is carcinogenic to humans (Group 1). In its evaluation, IARC judged evidence in humans as sufficient for some cancers (notably mesothelioma and bladder cancer) and limited for several others (including colon, prostate, testis, melanoma, and non-Hodgkin lymphoma), reflecting both real heterogeneity in risk and limitations of exposure characterization across cohorts [4].

Large cohort and meta-analytic work generally support a pattern of modest excess overall cancer risk with site-specific elevations that vary by study design, calendar period, and reference group [48]. A long follow-up Nordic cohort (about 16,000 firefighters) reported a small excess for all cancers combined (SIR around 1.06) and site-specific elevations

(e.g., prostate; mesothelioma in older groups) [297]. Recent meta-analysis work also synthesizes many cohorts/case-controls and highlights heterogeneity and exposure-assessment limitations across studies [296]. The interpretation of these studies is constrained by exposure misclassification (job title and duration as proxies for smoke dose), changes in building materials and PPE/SCBA practices over time, and correlated exposures that track with firefighting work but are not measured directly (diesel exhaust, asbestos, shift work). These limitations mean that the cancer literature is strong for hazard identification, but still weak for identifying which parts of the exposure system are most responsible and therefore which interventions (including PPE decontamination) should be prioritized.

5.2. Cardiovascular and Cardiometabolic Outcomes

Cardiovascular disease is a leading cause of on-duty mortality in firefighters, and the literature clearly shows that emergency duties can trigger acute physiological stress [298]. Controlled and semi-controlled studies of firefighting activities have documented acute increases in core temperature, heart rate, inflammatory markers, blood cell counts, and indicators of coagulation potential [3,299,300]. These responses interact with underlying cardiovascular risk profiles and may help explain why acute cardiac events cluster around strenuous duty periods.

However, a key gap is separating the contribution of inhaled/dermally absorbed combustion products from the contribution of heat stress and exertion, because these exposures co-occur. Wildland firefighter studies that pair smoke exposure surrogates with oxidative stress and vascular function measures provide suggestive evidence that smoke may contribute to vascular and oxidative pathways [4,301]. However, current cardiovascular evidence is strongest for risk timing and acute responses and weaker for quantitative long-term dose response attribution to smoke components.

5.3. Respiratory, Immune, and Other Non-Cancer Outcomes

Respiratory effects are biologically plausible given high particulate and irritant exposures, and many studies report acute symptoms or short-term lung function changes following smoke exposure [302]. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses indicate that firefighters can experience measurable respiratory impacts, but results vary by fire type (structural vs. wildland), task, protection practices, and the timing of measurement [303]. A persistent limitation is that many datasets lack detailed exposure characterization and rely on cross-sectional designs, making it difficult to distinguish the reversible short-term effects from accelerated long-term decline.

More broadly, smoke profiles are changing with materials, WUI events, and modern furnishings, raising the possibility that legacy exposure profiles do not fully represent contemporary hazards. This is a major scientific gap: without updated exposure characterization linked to health-relevant endpoints, the field risks building intervention targets around incomplete chemical libraries.

5.4. Biomarkers and Mechanistic Evidence

Biomonitoring studies are essential because they demonstrate that fire responses lead to measurable internal dose, even when PPE and SCBA are used [165]. The best-developed exposure biomarkers include urinary hydroxylated PAH metabolites (OH-PAHs) and metabolites of selected VOCs [163,174,304,305]. A meta-analysis of urinary OH-PAHs in firefighters reported consistent post-activity increases (on the order of up to ~1.7-fold), supporting the use of OH-PAHs as short-window indicators of recent exposure [306]. Broader systematic reviews show that firefighters have been monitored for VOCs, SVOCs, persistent organic pollutants (including some flame retardants), and metals, with urine and blood as the dominant matrices [173].

At the same time, biomarker evidence is often over-interpreted. Many exposure biomarkers have short biological half-lives, so timing (pre/post sampling windows) largely determines signal strength, and values are difficult to translate into cumulative dose without repeated sampling and kinetic modeling [27,127,163]. Biomarkers can also be non-specific (e.g., PAH metabolites influenced by diet or ambient air), and many studies do not fully standardize task logging, PPE condition, decontamination timing, or background exposures. These weaknesses limit the ability to link a given decontamination practice to a measurable reduction in internal dose.

Mechanistic evidence helps interpret plausibility. IARC mechanistic evaluation summarizes evidence for pathways such as genotoxicity, oxidative stress, and inflammation in firefighter exposure studies, particularly when study designs include pre-/post-sampling around fire events [4,301]. Beyond biomarkers of exposure, several studies have measured biomarkers of effect, including inflammatory proteins, mRNA expression signatures, and epigenetic alterations, which can help bridge the gap between short-term exposure and longer-term disease processes. However, these endpoints are still rarely integrated with detailed exposure measurement and long-term follow-up. This limits causal inference and reduces the ability to test whether contamination controls translate into reduced biological effect.

Table 2 summarizes common contaminant classes, key exposure metrics, and biomarkers and health indicators discussed in this review. Current evidence supports biological plausibility for adverse outcomes, but it does not establish that PPE contamination and incomplete decontamination causally drive chronic disease risk. From a Bradford Hill perspective, plausibility and coherence are strong because smoke contains known carcinogens and cardiopulmonary toxicants, and biomarker studies show short-term biological responses. Evidence for temporality and dose–response exists in some controlled studies, but intervention evidence remains sparse, and most disease endpoints require decades of follow-up. Longitudinal cohorts and intervention studies are therefore needed to test whether reducing PPE contamination produces sustained reductions in internal dose and the biomarkers of effect [4,85,301].

Table 2. Summary of major contaminant classes, common exposure metrics, biomarker and health outcomes.

Contaminant Class	Primary Sources	Major Exposure Routes and PPE Considerations	Common Metrics and Representative Field Ranges	Biomarkers of Exposure and Effect	Health Outcomes
PAHs and other SVOCs (e.g., naphthalene, pyrene)	Combustion of biomass and synthetic materials; structural, WUI, vehicle, and training fires.	Dermal deposition and transfer at interfaces; inhalation when SCBA is not used or is removed; PPE acts as a reservoir and secondary source (off-gassing/resuspension).	Personal air total PAHs during controlled structure fires: ~11–5970 µg/m ³ per burn (max reported ~22,000) [85]. PM-bound total PAHs during wildland prescribed burning: ~0.41–3.26 µg/m ³) [17].	Urinary OH-PAHs; exhaled breath VOC/SVOC. Effect biomarkers include oxidative stress and inflammatory markers [4,301].	PAHs include known carcinogens; acute respiratory irritation; potential cardiovascular stress via PM-related pathways.
VOCs (e.g., benzene, acrolein, formaldehyde, BTEXS)	Combustion gases from structural, vehicle, and wildland fires; off-gassing from contaminated PPE in cabs/stations.	Inhalation is dominant; dermal absorption contributes to some VOCs (e.g., benzene). PPE reduces inhalation when respiratory protection is used, but contaminated PPE can off-gas.	Controlled structure fires: post-fire change in exhaled-breath benzene ~7–34 µg/m ³ across burns [85]. Off-gassing studies detect benzene and other VOCs from PPE in enclosed spaces post-incident [38].	Exhaled-breath VOCs; urinary metabolites (e.g., S-PMA for benzene; 3-HPMA for acrolein). Effect biomarkers include gene expression and oxidative-stress signatures.	Acute mucosal irritation; benzene is linked to hematologic cancers; broader evidence supports cardiopulmonary effects for irritant gases and co-exposure to PM.

Table 2. Cont.

Contaminant Class	Primary Sources	Major Exposure Routes and PPE Considerations	Common Metrics and Representative Field Ranges	Biomarkers of Exposure and Effect	Health Outcomes
Metals/metalloids (e.g., Pb, Cr, Ni, Cu, Zn; battery-related Co, Mn, Ni)	Thermal degradation of building materials, electronics, and vehicles/EVs; ash and soil entrainment in wildland operations.	Inhalation of PM-bound metals; dermal deposition and transfer; metal-containing particles can accumulate on PPE surfaces.	Wildland prescribed burning: PM-bound metals ~262–661 ng/m ³ [17] (study-specific).	Blood/urine metals. Effect biomarkers include oxidative stress and inflammation.	Respiratory and systemic toxicity depends on metal speciation and dose; some metals are carcinogenic or neurotoxic.
PFAS (e.g., PFOS, PFOA, PFHxS; precursors)	AFFF (training and some Class B fuel incidents), turnout gear membranes/textile treatments, and contaminated dust/gear storage.	Dermal contact and ingestion via dust; inhalation of dust; long biological persistence and slow clearance.	Serum PFAS concentrations are typically reported in ng/mL; example geometric means in one volunteer department: PFOA 2.07 ng/mL, PFOS 4.25 ng/mL, PFHxS 1.83 ng/mL [77].	Serum PFAS; effect indicators include thyroid hormone changes and lipid/endocrine markers.	Broader epidemiology links PFAS to immune, thyroid, lipid, and some cancer outcomes; firefighter-specific causal attribution remains limited.
Plastic additives and flame retardants (OPFRs, NPBFRs, PBDEs, phthalates)	Turnout gear materials and treatments; furnishings/electronics combustion; contaminated dust in stations and apparatus.	Dermal contact with gear and contaminated surfaces; inhalation/ingestion of dust; cross-contamination during laundering is possible.	Silicone wristbands on shift: OPFR concentrations ~0.1–863 ng/g (compound-dependent) [35]. Laundering can reduce OPFRs and PAHs in hoods, but PBDE increases indicate cross-contamination potential [63].	Urinary metabolites (e.g., BDCPP for TDCPP); effect biomarkers can include thyroid hormone changes.	Evidence varies by compound; concerns include endocrine disruption (thyroid and reproduction) and neurodevelopmental toxicity.

6. Conclusions

Respiratory protection against acute fireground hazards has improved in many settings. However, chronic exposure remains a major concern, including dermal and secondary inhalation exposure to complex chemical mixtures during and after incidents. PPE that prevents thermal injury can also store and transport contaminants, which can later off-gas, resuspend, or transfer during handling and reuse. Fire smoke therefore remains a central occupational hazard, because the mixture varies across incident types and phases and because contaminants can persist after visible smoke through deposition on skin, textiles, apparatus, and station environments. This evidence supports the IARC classification of occupational exposure in firefighting as carcinogenic to humans and reinforces the need for controls that address cumulative dose in addition to short-term peaks.

A fundamental limitation in current occupational health assessments is the inability to comprehensively quantify individual firefighter dose. Reliance on assignments, incident counts, or task averages as proxies for exposure obscures substantial inter-individual variability driven by role, tactics, PPE, and work practices. Exposures occurring outside active suppression—including off-gassing within apparatus cabs, contamination in station living quarters, routine training evolutions, and cross-contamination during PPE donning and doffing—are rarely quantified at the personal level, yet likely contribute meaningfully to cumulative internal dose. The near-complete absence of practical, continuous personal exposure monitoring systems capable of capturing inhalation, dermal, and ingestion pathways across the fuel duty cycle remains a critical gap. Without personal-level exposure data linked to biomarkers and health outcomes, it is not possible to establish health-based thresholds for acceptable PPE residue or to rigorously evaluate intervention effectiveness at the individual level.

While on-scene gross decontamination represents a meaningful cultural shift, the effectiveness of advanced cleaning remains largely empirical. There are fewer standardized, firefighter-relevant metrics to verify that laundering or extraction has reduced carcinogenic

residues to acceptable levels; success is often inferred from sensory cues rather than chemical evidence. Progress is further limited by the lack of standardized platforms that can reproducibly generate realistic multi-phase smoke, load full PPE ensembles under representative conditions, and quantify residue, off-gassing, and transfer in comparable ways. In parallel, tension remains between aggressive decontamination and long-term PPE material and design integrity.

Future work must therefore prioritize field-deployable verification tools for gear cleanliness, standardized exposure and PPE contamination platforms, and personal monitoring systems that span a full duty cycle. Advancing from descriptive measurements to validated, mechanistic frameworks is essential to demonstrate true reductions in internal dose and long-term health risk among firefighters.

This review has limitations. Most evidence comes from North America, Australia, and parts of Europe. Many studies are cross-sectional or have small samples, which limit generalizability across fire services, tasks, and climates. Laboratory simulations improve experimental control but may not reflect field conditions, including heat, sweating, pressure, repeated contamination and recontamination, and operational constraints. We therefore treat quantitative estimates as context dependent and prioritize consistency across methods over any single value.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, Y.W. and G.S.; investigation, Y.W.; writing—original draft preparation, Y.W. and M.Z.; writing—review and editing, M.Z., R.L., and G.S.; visualization, M.Z.; supervision, R.L. and G.S.; funding acquisition, G.S. and R.L. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This work was supported by the Fire Prevention and Safety (FP&S) Research and Development Grant Program, administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) [EMW-2021-FP-00088; EMW-2023-FP-00242].

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Acknowledgments: During the preparation of this work the authors used AI-assisted technologies and grammar-checking tools in order to improve the language and readability of the manuscript. After using these tools/services, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:

VOCs	Volatile organic compounds
BTEXs	Benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes
PAHs	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
PM	Particulate matter
PFAS	Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances
DEHP	Di-(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate
AFFF	Aqueous film-forming foam
WUI	Wildland–urban interface
PPE	Personal protective equipment
SCBA	Self-contained breathing apparatus
IARC	International Agency for Research on Cancer
IAFF	International Association of Fire Fighters

NFPA	National Fire Protection Association
EVs	Electric vehicles
ECHA	European chemical agency

References

- Quintela, D.; Gaspar, A.; Raimundo, A.; Oliveira, A. Working conditions of firefighters: Physiological measurements, subjective assessments and thermal insulation of protective clothing. In *Occupational Safety and Hygiene*; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2013; pp. 521–526.
- Willi, J.M.; Horn, G.P.; Madrzykowski, D. Characterizing a firefighter's immediate thermal environment in live-fire training scenarios. *Fire Technol.* **2016**, *52*, 1667–1696. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Navarro, K.M.; Kleinman, M.T.; Mackay, C.E.; Reinhardt, T.E.; Balmes, J.R.; Broyles, G.A.; Ottmar, R.D.; Naher, L.P.; Domitrovich, J.W. Wildland firefighter smoke exposure and risk of lung cancer and cardiovascular disease mortality. *Environ. Res.* **2019**, *173*, 462–468. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Demers, P.A.; DeMarini, D.M.; Fent, K.W.; Glass, D.C.; Hansen, J.; Adetona, O.; Andersen, M.H.; Freeman, L.E.B.; Caban-Martinez, A.J.; Daniels, R.D. Carcinogenicity of occupational exposure as a firefighter. *Lancet Oncol.* **2022**, *23*, 985–986. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
- Fahy, R.F.; Evarts, B.; Stein, G.P. *US Fire Department Profile 2020*; National Fire Protection Association: Quincy, MA, USA, 2022.
- Hall, S.; Evarts, B. *Fire Loss in the United States During 2021*; National Fire Protection Association (NFPA): Quincy, MA, USA, 2022.
- Campbell, R.; Hall, S. *United States Firefighter Injuries in 2022*; NFPA: Quincy, MA, USA, 2023. Available online: <https://www.nfpa.org/education-and-research/research/nfpa-research/fire-statistical-reports/firefighter-injuries-in-the-united-states> (accessed on 20 December 2025).
- Fahy, R.F.; Petrillo, J.T. *Firefighter Fatalities in the US in 2020*; NFPA: Quincy, MA, USA, 2021.
- Frieland, S.K. *Smoke, Dust, and Haze-Fundamentals of Aerosol Behavior*; John Wiley & Sons Inc.: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 1977.
- McAllister, S.; Chen, J.-Y.; Fernandez-Pello, A.C. *Fundamentals of Combustion Processes*; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2011; Volume 302.
- Fabian, T.Z.; Borgerson, J.L.; Gandhi, P.D.; Baxter, C.S.; Ross, C.S.; Lockey, J.E.; Dalton, J.M. Characterization of firefighter smoke exposure. *Fire Technol.* **2014**, *50*, 993–1019. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Kesler, R.M.; Sauer, N.; Barowy, A.; Probert, C.; Neumann, D.L.; Mayer, A.C.; Niemeier-Walsh, M.; Fent, K.W.; Stapleton, H.M.; Horn, G.P. Evaluation of combustion products in air from electric and internal combustion engine vehicles during full-scale fire experiments. *Fire Saf. J.* **2025**, *158*, 104558. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Fent, K.W.; Mayer, A.; Bertke, S.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D.; Horn, G.P. Understanding airborne contaminants produced by different fuel packages during training fires. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2019**, *16*, 532–543. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Austin, C. *Municipal Firefighter Exposures to Toxic Gases and Vapours*; McGill University Libraries: Montreal, QC, Canada, 1997.
- Wesolek, D.; Kozłowski, R. Toxic gaseous products of thermal decomposition and combustion of natural and synthetic fabrics with and without flame retardant. *Fire Mater.* **2002**, *26*, 215–224. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Lin, L.; Ezekoye, O.A. Time-resolved characterization of toxic and flammable gases during venting of li-ion cylindrical cells with current interrupt devices. *J. Loss Prev. Process Ind.* **2025**, *94*, 105488. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Teixeira, J.; Sousa, G.; Azevedo, R.; Almeida, A.; Delerue-Matos, C.; Wang, X.; Santos-Silva, A.; Rodrigues, F.; Oliveira, M. Characterization of wildland firefighters' exposure to coarse, fine, and ultrafine particles; polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons; and metal(loid)s, and estimation of associated health risks. *Toxics* **2024**, *12*, 422. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Islam, M.M.; Mandal, S.; Al-Mashala, H.H.; Schnitzler, E.G.; Petrova, A.; Agnew, R.J.; Boorady, L.M. Wildfire smoke and firefighter safety: A review of toxic particle exposure, clothing performance and health implications. *Fire Mater.* **2025**, *50*, 64–78. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Evans, D.E.; Fent, K.W. Ultrafine and respirable particle exposure during vehicle fire suppression. *Environ. Sci. Process. Impacts* **2015**, *17*, 1749–1759. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Teixeira, J.; Sousa, G.; Morais, S.; Delerue-Matos, C.; Oliveira, M. Assessment of coarse, fine, and ultrafine particulate matter at different microenvironments of fire stations. *Chemosphere* **2023**, *335*, 139005. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Brandt-Rauf, P.; Fallon, L.; Tarantini, T.; Idema, C.; Andrews, L. Health hazards of fire fighters: Exposure assessment. *Occup. Environ. Med.* **1988**, *45*, 606–612. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Zhou, X.; Josey, K.; Kamareddine, L.; Caine, M.C.; Liu, T.; Mickley, L.J.; Cooper, M.; Dominici, F. Excess of covid-19 cases and deaths due to fine particulate matter exposure during the 2020 wildfires in the united states. *Sci. Adv.* **2021**, *7*, eabi8789. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Mayer, A.C.; Fent, K.W.; Wilkinson, A.F.; Chen, I.C.; Siegel, M.R.; Toennis, C.; Sammons, D.; Meadows, J.; Kesler, R.M.; Kerber, S.; et al. Evaluating exposure to VOCs and naphthalene for firefighters wearing different PPE configurations through measures in air, exhaled breath, and urine. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2023**, *20*, 6057. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
- Rogula-Kozłowska, W.; Piątek, P.; Kozielska, B.; Walczak, A. Off-gassing from firefighter suits (nomex) as an indoor source of BTEXs. *Chemosphere* **2024**, *350*, 140996. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]

25. Mayer, A.C.; Fent, K.W.; Wilkinson, A.; Chen, I.C.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D.L.; Kesler, R.M.; Horn, G.P. Characterizing exposure to benzene, toluene, and naphthalene in firefighters wearing different types of new or laundered PPE. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* **2022**, *240*, 113900. [CrossRef]
26. Teixeira, J.; Bessa, M.J.; Delerue-Matos, C.; Sarmiento, B.; Santos-Silva, A.; Rodrigues, F.; Oliveira, M. Human exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons during structure fires: Concentrations outside and inside self-contained breathing apparatus and in vitro respiratory toxicity. *Environ. Pollut.* **2025**, *373*, 126112. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
27. Fent, K.W.; Toennis, C.; Sammons, D.; Robertson, S.; Bertke, S.; Calafat, A.M.; Pleil, J.D.; Wallace, M.A.G.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D. Firefighters' absorption of PAHs and VOCs during controlled residential fires by job assignment and fire attack tactic. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.* **2020**, *30*, 338–349. [CrossRef]
28. Wang, H.; Wang, J.; Zhao, B.; Hu, S.; Xue, G.; Xia, J. Contamination and removal of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in multilayered assemblies of firefighting protective clothing. *J. Ind. Text.* **2022**, *52*, 15280837221130772. [CrossRef]
29. Stec, A.A.; Dickens, K.E.; Salden, M.; Hewitt, F.E.; Watts, D.P.; Houldsworth, P.E.; Martin, F.L. Occupational exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and elevated cancer incidence in firefighters. *Sci. Rep.* **2018**, *8*, 2476. [CrossRef]
30. Valavanidis, A.; Iliopoulos, N.; Gotsis, G.; Fiotakis, K. Persistent free radicals, heavy metals and PAHs generated in particulate soot emissions and residue ash from controlled combustion of common types of plastic. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2008**, *156*, 277–284. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
31. Al-Malki, A.L. Serum heavy metals and hemoglobin related compounds in saudi arabia firefighters. *J. Occup. Med. Toxicol.* **2009**, *4*, 18. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
32. Young, A.S.; Sparer-Fine, E.H.; Pickard, H.M.; Sunderland, E.M.; Peaslee, G.F.; Allen, J.G. Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and total fluorine in fire station dust. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.* **2021**, *31*, 930–942. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
33. Alexander, B.M.; Baxter, C.S. Plasticizer contamination of firefighter personal protective clothing—a potential factor in increased health risks in firefighters. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2014**, *11*, D43–D48. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
34. Silver, G.; Krastev, Y.; Forbes, M.K.; Hamdorf, B.; Lewis, B.; Tisbury, M.; Taylor, M.P.; Gasiorowski, R. Study protocol for a randomised controlled trial examining the effect of blood and plasma donation on serum perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substance (PFAS) levels in firefighters. *BMJ Open* **2021**, *11*, e044833. [CrossRef]
35. Papas, W.; Aranda-Rodriguez, R.; Fan, X.; Kubwabo, C.; Lee, J.S.; Fantin, E.; Zheng, E.D.; Keir, J.L.; Matschke, D.; Blais, J.M.; et al. Occupational exposure of on-shift ottawa firefighters to flame retardants and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. *Toxics* **2024**, *12*, 667. [CrossRef]
36. Evans, D.; Fent, K. *Evaluation of Dermal Exposure to Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Fire Fighters*; US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health: Washington, DC, USA, 2013.
37. Oliveira, M.; Slezakova, K.; Alves, M.J.; Fernandes, A.; Teixeira, J.P.; Delerue-Matos, C.; do Carmo Pereira, M.; Morais, S. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons at fire stations: Firefighters' exposure monitoring and biomonitoring, and assessment of the contribution to total internal dose. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2017**, *323*, 184–194. [CrossRef]
38. Fent, K.W.; Evans, D.E.; Booher, D.; Pleil, J.D.; Stiegel, M.A.; Horn, G.P.; Dalton, J. Volatile organic compounds off-gassing from firefighters' personal protective equipment ensembles after use. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2015**, *12*, 404–414. [CrossRef]
39. Islam, M.M. *Characterizing the Composition of Contamination in Wildland Firefighters' Protective Clothing Due to the Combustion of Wood*; Oklahoma State University: Stillwater, OK, USA, 2024; p. 86. Available online: <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/characterizing-composition-contamination-wildland/docview/3080053877/se-2?accountid=10906> (accessed on 20 December 2025).
40. Keir, J.L.; Akhtar, U.S.; Matschke, D.M.; White, P.A.; Kirkham, T.L.; Chan, H.M.; Blais, J.M. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (pah) and metal contamination of air and surfaces exposed to combustion emissions during emergency fire suppression: Implications for firefighters' exposures. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, *698*, 134211. [CrossRef]
41. Kirk, K.M.; Logan, M.B. Firefighting instructors' exposures to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons during live fire training scenarios. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2015**, *12*, 227–234. [CrossRef]
42. Navarro, K.M.; Fent, K.; Mayer, A.C.; Brueck, S.E.; Toennis, C.; Law, B.; Meadows, J.; Sammons, D.; Brown, S. Characterization of inhalation exposures at a wildfire incident during the wildland firefighter exposure and health effects (wffehe) study. *Ann. Work Expo. Health* **2023**, *67*, 1011–1017. [CrossRef]
43. Banks, A.P.; Wang, X.; He, C.; Gallen, M.; Thomas, K.V.; Mueller, J.F. Off-gassing of semi-volatile organic compounds from fire-fighters' uniforms in private vehicles—A pilot study. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2021**, *18*, 3030. [CrossRef]
44. Oliveira, M.; Slezakova, K.; Fernandes, A.; Teixeira, J.P.; Delerue-Matos, C.; do Carmo Pereira, M.; Morais, S. Occupational exposure of firefighters to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in non-fire work environments. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2017**, *592*, 277–287. [CrossRef]

45. Brown, F.R.; Whitehead, T.P.; Park, J.-S.; Metayer, C.; Petreas, M.X. Levels of non-polybrominated diphenyl ether brominated flame retardants in residential house dust samples and fire station dust samples in california. *Environ. Res.* **2014**, *135*, 9–14. [CrossRef]
46. Hwang, J.; Taylor, R.; Cann, C.; Norris, P.; Golla, V. Evaluation of accumulated polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and asbestiform fibers on firefighter vehicles: Pilot study. *Fire Technol.* **2019**, *55*, 2195–2213. [CrossRef]
47. Fahy, R.F.; Petrillo, J.T. *Firefighter Fatalities in the US in 2021*; NFPA: Quincy, MA, USA, 2022.
48. Daniels, R.D.; Kubale, T.L.; Yiin, J.H.; Dahm, M.M.; Hales, T.R.; Baris, D.; Zahm, S.H.; Beaumont, J.J.; Waters, K.M.; Pinkerton, L.E. Mortality and cancer incidence in a pooled cohort of us firefighters from san francisco, chicago and philadelphia (1950–2009). *Occup. Environ. Med.* **2014**, *71*, 388–397. [CrossRef]
49. Pinkerton, L.; Bertke, S.J.; Yiin, J.; Dahm, M.; Kubale, T.; Hales, T.; Purdue, M.; Beaumont, J.J.; Daniels, R. Mortality in a cohort of us firefighters from san francisco, chicago and philadelphia: An update. *Occup. Environ. Med.* **2020**, *77*, 84–93. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
50. Armstrong, B.; Hutchinson, E.; Unwin, J.; Fletcher, T. Lung cancer risk after exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons: A review and meta-analysis. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2004**, *112*, 970–978. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
51. Daniels, R.D.; Bertke, S.; Dahm, M.M.; Yiin, J.H.; Kubale, T.L.; Hales, T.R.; Baris, D.; Zahm, S.H.; Beaumont, J.J.; Waters, K.M. Exposure–response relationships for select cancer and non-cancer health outcomes in a cohort of us firefighters from san francisco, chicago and philadelphia (1950–2009). *Occup. Environ. Med.* **2015**, *72*, 699–706. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
52. Casjens, S.; Brüning, T.; Taeger, D. Taeger, Cancer risks of firefighters: A systematic review and meta-analysis of secular trends and region-specific differences. *Int. Arch. Occup. Environ. Health* **2020**, *93*, 839–852. [CrossRef]
53. Howe, G.R.; Burch, J.D. Fire fighters and risk of cancer: An assessment and overview of the epidemiologic evidence. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **1990**, *132*, 1039–1050.
54. LeMasters, G.K.; Genaigy, A.M.; Succop, P.; Deddens, J.; Sobeih, T.; Barriera-Viruet, H.; Dunning, K.; Lockey, J. Cancer risk among firefighters: A review and meta-analysis of 32 studies. *J. Occup. Environ. Med.* **2006**, *48*, 1189–1202. [CrossRef]
55. Tsai, R.J.; Luckhaupt, S.E.; Schumacher, P.; Cress, R.D.; Deapen, D.M.; Calvert, G.M. Risk of cancer among firefighters in california, 1988–2007. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* **2015**, *58*, 715–729. [CrossRef]
56. IAFF. Faq, What Are Some of the Latest Statistics Related to Cancer in the Fire Service? 2021. Available online: <https://www.firefightercancersupport.org/resources/faq/> (accessed on 20 December 2025).
57. Fent, K.W.; Alexander, B.; Roberts, J.; Robertson, S.; Toennis, C.; Sammons, D.; Bertke, S.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D.; Horn, G. Contamination of firefighter personal protective equipment and skin and the effectiveness of decontamination procedures. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2017**, *14*, 801–814. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
58. Arouca, A.M.; Aleixo, V.E.D.; Vieira, M.L.; Talhavini, M.; Weber, I.T. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon contamination of personal protective equipment of brazilian firefighters during training exercise. *J. Braz. Chem. Soc.* **2025**, *36*, e20250089. [CrossRef]
59. Szmytke, E.; Brzezińska, D.; Machnowski, W.; Kokot, S. Firefighters’ clothing contamination in fires of electric vehicle batteries and photovoltaic modules—Literature review and pilot tests results. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2022**, *19*, 12442. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
60. Krzemińska, S.; Szewczyńska, M. Pah contamination of firefighter protective clothing and cleaning effectiveness. *Fire Saf. J.* **2022**, *131*, 103610. [CrossRef]
61. Horn, G.P.; Madrzykowski, D.; Neumann, D.L.; Mayer, A.C.; Fent, K.W. Airborne contamination during post-fire investigations: Hot, warm and cold scenes. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2022**, *19*, 35–49. [CrossRef]
62. Wingfors, H.; Nyholm, J.R.; Magnusson, R.; Wijkmark, C.H. Impact of fire suit ensembles on firefighter pah exposures as assessed by skin deposition and urinary biomarkers. *Ann. Work Expo. Health* **2018**, *62*, 221–231. [CrossRef]
63. Mayer, A.C.; Fent, K.W.; Bertke, S.; Horn, G.P.; Smith, D.L.; Kerber, S.; La Guardia, M.J. Firefighter hood contamination: Efficiency of laundering to remove PAHs and FRs. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2019**, *16*, 129–140. [CrossRef]
64. Li, G.; Shanov, V.; Schulz, M.J. *Tracking Toxic Gases Penetration Through Firefighter’s Garment*; CDC: Atlanta, GA, USA, 2009.
65. He, M.; Ghee, T.A.; Dhaniyala, S. Aerosol penetration through fabrics: Experiments and theory. *Aerosol Sci. Technol.* **2020**, *55*, 289–301. [CrossRef]
66. Jaques, P.A.; Portnoff, L. Evaluation of a passive method for determining particle penetration through protective clothing materials. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2017**, *14*, 995–1002. [CrossRef]
67. Shaw, S.D.; Berger, M.L.; Harris, J.H.; Yun, S.H.; Wu, Q.; Liao, C.; Blum, A.; Stefani, A.; Kannan, K. Persistent organic pollutants including polychlorinated and polybrominated dibenzo-p-dioxins and dibenzofurans in firefighters from northern California. *Chemosphere* **2013**, *91*, 1386–1394. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
68. Fang, T.; Hwang, B.C.H.; Kapur, S.; Hopstock, K.S.; Wei, J.L.; Nguyen, V.; Nizkorodov, S.A.; Shiraiwa, M. Wildfire particulate matter as a source of environmentally persistent free radicals and reactive oxygen species. *Environ. Sci. Atmos.* **2023**, *3*, 581–594. [CrossRef]

69. Sjöström, M.; Julander, A.; Strandberg, B.; Lewné, M.; Bigert, C. Airborne and dermal exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds, and particles among firefighters and police investigators. *Ann. Work Expo. Health* **2019**, *63*, 533–545. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
70. Knipp, M.J. Assessment of Municipal Firefighters' Dermal Occupational Exposure to Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons. Master's Thesis, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, USA, 2010.
71. Keir, J.L.A.; Kirkham, T.L.; Aranda-Rodriguez, R.; White, P.A.; Blais, J.M. Effectiveness of dermal cleaning interventions for reducing firefighters' exposures to PAHs and genotoxins. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2023**, *20*, 84–94. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
72. Bonner, E.M.; Horn, G.P.; Smith, D.L.; Kerber, S.; Fent, K.W.; Tidwell, L.G.; Scott, R.P.; Adams, K.T.; Anderson, K.A. Silicone passive sampling used to identify novel dermal chemical exposures of firefighters and assess PPE innovations. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* **2023**, *248*, 114095. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
73. *Nfpa 1851*; Standard on Selection, Care, and Maintenance of Protective Ensembles for Structural Fire Fighting and Proximity Fire Fighting. NFPA: Quincy, MA, USA, 2020.
74. Stull, J.O. *PPE: How Clean Is Clean? Fire Engineering PPE Supplement*; NFPA: Quincy, MA, USA, 2018.
75. Crown, E.M.; Feng, A.; Xu, X. How clean is clean enough? Maintaining thermal protective clothing under field conditions in the oil and gas sector. *Int. J. Occup. Saf. Ergon.* **2004**, *10*, 247–254. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
76. Banks, A.P.; Wang, X.; Engelsman, M.; He, C.; Osorio, A.F.; Mueller, J.F. Assessing decontamination and laundering processes for the removal of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and flame retardants from firefighting uniforms. *Environ. Res.* **2021**, *194*, 110616. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
77. Graber, J.M.; Black, T.M.; Shah, N.N.; Caban-Martinez, A.J.; Lu, S.E.; Brancard, T.; Yu, C.H.; Turyk, M.E.; Black, K.; Steinberg, M.B.; et al. Prevalence and predictors of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) serum levels among members of a suburban us volunteer fire department. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2021**, *18*, 3730. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
78. Cornelsen, M.; Weber, R.; Panglisch, S. Minimizing the environmental impact of PFAS by using specialized coagulants for the treatment of PFAS polluted waters and for the decontamination of firefighting equipment. *Emerg. Contam.* **2021**, *7*, 63–76. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
79. Bell, E.M.; De Guise, S.; McCutcheon, J.R.; Lei, Y.; Levin, M.; Li, B.; Rusling, J.F.; Lawrence, D.A.; Cavallari, J.M.; O'Connell, C.; et al. Exposure, health effects, sensing, and remediation of the emerging PFAS contaminants—Scientific challenges and potential research directions. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *780*, 146399. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
80. Glüge, J.; Scheringer, M.; Cousins, I.T.; DeWitt, J.C.; Goldenman, G.; Herzke, D.; Lohmann, R.; Ng, C.A.; Trier, X.; Wang, Z. An overview of the uses of per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). *Environ. Sci. Process. Impacts* **2020**, *22*, 2345–2373. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
81. Schellenberger, S.; Liagkouridis, I.; Awad, R.; Khan, S.; Plassmann, M.; Peters, G.; Benskin, J.P.; Cousins, I.T. An outdoor aging study to investigate the release of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) from functional textiles. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2022**, *56*, 3471–3479. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
82. Dai, X.; Xie, Z.; Dorian, B.; Gray, S.; Zhang, J. Comparative study of PFAS treatment by uv, uv /ozone, and fractionations with air and ozonated air. *Environ. Sci. Water Res. Technol.* **2019**, *5*, 1897–1907. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
83. Bolstad-Johnson, D.M.; Burgess, J.L.; Crutchfield, C.D.; Stormont, S.; Gerkin, R.; Wilson, J.R. Characterization of firefighter exposures during fire overhaul. *AIHAJ-Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc.* **2000**, *61*, 636–641. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
84. Licina, D.; Morrison, G.C.; Bekö, G.; Weschler, C.J.; Nazaroff, W.W. Clothing-mediated exposures to chemicals and particles. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2019**, *53*, 5559–5575. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
85. Fent, K.W.; Eisenberg, J.; Snawder, J.; Sammons, D.; Pleil, J.D.; Stiegel, M.A.; Mueller, C.; Horn, G.P.; Dalton, J. Systemic exposure to PAHs and benzene in firefighters suppressing controlled structure fires. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* **2014**, *58*, 830–845. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
86. Hirschler, M.M. Fire retardance, smoke toxicity and fire hazard. In *Flame Retardants*; BPF: London, UK, 1994.
87. Reisen, F. *Inventory of Major Materials Present in and Around Houses and Their Combustion Emission Products*; Report to Bushfire CRC.; Bushfire CRC: Melbourne, Australia, 2011; p. 7.
88. Kirk, K.M.; Logan, M.B. Structural fire fighting ensembles: Accumulation and off-gassing of combustion products. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2015**, *12*, 376–383. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
89. Horn, G.P.; Kerber, S.; Andrews, J.; Kesler, R.M.; Newman, H.; Stewart, J.W.; Fent, K.W.; Smith, D.L. Impact of repeated exposure and cleaning on protective properties of structural firefighting turnout gear. *Fire Technol.* **2021**, *57*, 791–813. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
90. Reisen, F.; Bhujel, M.; Leonard, J. Particle and volatile organic emissions from the combustion of a range of building and furnishing materials using a cone calorimeter. *Fire Saf. J.* **2014**, *69*, 76–88. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
91. Shemwell, B.E.; Levendis, Y.A. Particulates generated from combustion of polymers (plastics). *J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.* **2000**, *50*, 94–102. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
92. Tame, N.W.; Dlugogorski, B.Z.; Kennedy, E.M. Formation of dioxins and furans during combustion of treated wood. *Prog. Energy Combust. Sci.* **2007**, *33*, 384–408. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

93. Tomsej, T.; Horak, J.; Tomsejova, S.; Krpec, K.; Klanova, J.; Dej, M.; Hopan, F. The impact of co-combustion of polyethylene plastics and wood in a small residential boiler on emissions of gaseous pollutants, particulate matter, PAHs and 1,3,5-triphenylbenzene. *Chemosphere* **2018**, *196*, 18–24. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
94. Wheatley, L.; Levendis, Y.A.; Vouros, P. Exploratory study on the combustion and pah emissions of selected municipal waste plastics. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **1993**, *27*, 2885–2895. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
95. Fent, K.W.; Evans, D.E.; Babik, K.; Striley, C.; Bertke, S.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D.; Horn, G.P. Airborne contaminants during controlled residential fires. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2018**, *15*, 399–412. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
96. Peterson, D.L.; McCaffrey, S.M.; Patel-Weynand, T. *Wildland Fire Smoke in the United States: A Scientific Assessment*; Springer Nature: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2022.
97. Nelson, J.; Chalbot, M.-C.G.; Tsiodra, I.; Mihalopoulos, N.; Kavouras, I.G. Physicochemical characterization of personal exposures to smoke aerosol and PAHs of wildland firefighters in prescribed fires. *Expo. Health* **2021**, *13*, 105–118. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
98. Prichard, S.J.; O'Neill, S.M.; Eagle, P.; Andreu, A.G.; Drye, B.; Dubowy, J.; Urbanski, S.; Strand, T.M. Wildland fire emission factors in north america: Synthesis of existing data, measurement needs and management applications. *Int. J. Wildland Fire* **2020**, *29*, 132–147. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
99. Kim, Y.H.; Warren, S.H.; Krantz, Q.T.; King, C.; Jaskot, R.; Preston, W.T.; George, B.J.; Hays, M.D.; Landis, M.S.; Higuchi, M.; et al. Mutagenicity and lung toxicity of smoldering vs. Flaming emissions from various biomass fuels: Implications for health effects from wildland fires. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2018**, *126*, 017011. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
100. Urbanski, S. Wildland fire emissions, carbon, and climate: Emission factors. *For. Ecol. Manag.* **2014**, *317*, 51–60. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
101. Oliveira, M.; Slezakova, K.; Magalhães, C.P.; Fernandes, A.; Teixeira, J.P.; Delerue-Matos, C.; do Carmo Pereira, M.; Morais, S. Individual and cumulative impacts of fire emissions and tobacco consumption on wildland firefighters' total exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2017**, *334*, 10–20. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
102. Adetona, O.; Simpson, C.D.; Onstad, G.; Naeher, L.P. Exposure of wildland firefighters to carbon monoxide, fine particles, and levoglucosan. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* **2013**, *57*, 979–991. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
103. Burgess, J.L.; Nanson, C.J.; Bolstad-Johnson, D.M.; Gerkin, R.; Hysong, T.A.; Lantz, R.C.; Sherrill, D.L.; Crutchfield, C.D.; Quan, S.F.; Bernard, A.M. Adverse respiratory effects following overhaul in firefighters. *J. Occup. Environ. Med.* **2001**, *43*, 467–473. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
104. Jones, L.; Lutz, E.A.; Duncan, M.; Burgess, J.L. Respiratory protection for firefighters—Evaluation of cbrn canisters for use during overhaul. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2015**, *12*, 314–322. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
105. Broznitsky, N.; Shum, M.; Kinniburgh, D.; Lichty, D.; Tiu, S.; Toic, T.; Zadunayski, T.; Cherry, N. A field investigation of 3 masks proposed as respiratory protection for wildland firefighters: A randomized controlled trial in british columbia, canada. *Ann. Work. Expo. Health* **2024**, *68*, 906–918. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
106. Garg, P.; Wang, S.; Oakes, J.M.; Bellini, C.; Gollner, M.J. The effectiveness of filter material for respiratory protection worn by wildland firefighters. *Fire Saf. J.* **2023**, *139*, 103811. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
107. Kalazic, A.; Brnada, S.; Kis, A. Thermal protective properties and breathability of multilayer protective woven fabrics for wildland firefighting. *Polymers* **2022**, *14*, 2967. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
108. *Nfpa 1977*; Standard on Protective Clothing and Equipment for Wildland Fire Fighting. NFPA: Quincy, MA, USA, 2005.
109. Mazumder, N.-U.-S. Toward the future of firefighter gear: Assessing fluorinated and non-fluorinated outer shells following simulated on-the-job exposures. *J. Ind. Text.* **2023**, *53*, 15280837231217401. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
110. Morrison, G.C.; Weschler, C.J.; Bekö, G.; Koch, H.M. Role of clothing in both accelerating and impeding dermal absorption of airborne SVOCs. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.* **2016**, *26*, 113–118. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
111. Fent, K.W.; Evans, D.E.; Couch, J. *Evaluation of Chemical and Particle Exposures During Vehicle Fire Suppression Training*; Department of Health and Human Services: Washington, DC, USA; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Atlanta, GA, USA; National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health: Washington, DC, USA, 2010.
112. Fent, K.W.; Evans, D.E. Assessing the risk to firefighters from chemical vapors and gases during vehicle fire suppression. *J. Environ. Monit.* **2011**, *13*, 536–543. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
113. Truchot, B.; Fouillen, F.; Collet, S. An experimental evaluation of toxic gas emissions from vehicle fires. *Fire Saf. J.* **2018**, *97*, 111–118. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
114. Kuti, R.; Tanczos, P.; Tanczos, Z.; Stadler, T.; Papp, C. Examination of harmful substances emitted to the environment during an electric vehicle fire with a full-scale fire experiment and laboratory investigations. *J. Exp. Theor. Anal.* **2025**, *3*, 1. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
115. Kim, Y.H.; Nored, A.; Horn, G.P.; Kesler, R.M.; Barowy, A.; Schraiber, A.; Gaudet, B.; Mayer, A.C.; Niemeier-Walsh, M.; Fent, K.W.; et al. Chemical components of electric vehicle and internal combustion engine vehicle fire smoke and their mutagenic effects. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **2025**, *32*, 26629–26639. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
116. Willstrand, O.; Bisschop, R.; Blomqvist, P.; Temple, A.; Anderson, J. Toxic Gases from Electric Vehicle Fires. 2020. Available online: https://www.ri.se/sites/default/files/2020-12/FIVE2020_Willstrand.pdf (accessed on 20 December 2025).

117. Liu, J.; Xu, N.; Shi, Y.; Barnett, T.; Jones, S. Are first responders prepared for electric vehicle fires? A national survey. *Accid. Anal. Prev.* **2023**, *179*, 106903. [CrossRef]
118. Tang, W.; Emmons, L.K.; Wiedinmyer, C.; Partha, D.B.; Huang, Y.; He, C.; Zhang, J.; Barsanti, K.C.; Gaubert, B.; Jo, D.S.; et al. Disproportionately large impacts of wildland-urban interface fire emissions on global air quality and human health. *Sci. Adv.* **2025**, *11*, eadr2616. [CrossRef]
119. Holder, A.L.; Ahmed, A.; Vukovich, J.M.; Rao, V. Hazardous air pollutant emissions estimates from wildfires in the wildland urban interface. *PNAS Nexus* **2023**, *2*, pgad186. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
120. Benedict, K.B.; Lee, J.E.; Kumar, N.; Badal, P.S.; Barbato, M.; Dubey, M.K.; Aiken, A.C. Wildland urban interface (WUI) emissions: Laboratory measurement of aerosol and trace gas from combustion of manufactured building materials. *ACS EST Air* **2024**, *1*, 1673–1686. [CrossRef]
121. Silberstein, J.M.; Mael, L.E.; Frischmon, C.R.; Rieves, E.S.; Coffey, E.R.; Das, T.; Dresser, W.; Hatch, A.C.; Nath, J.; Pliszka, H.O.; et al. Residual impacts of a wildland urban interface fire on urban particulate matter and dust: A study from the marshall fire. *Air Qual. Atmos. Health* **2023**, *16*, 1839–1850. [CrossRef]
122. Alshehri, T.; Wang, J.J.; Singerling, S.A.; Gigault, J.; Webster, J.P.; Matiassek, S.J.; Alpers, C.N.; Baalousha, M. Wildland-urban interface fire ashes as a major source of incidental nanomaterials. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2023**, *443*, 130311. [CrossRef]
123. FIRESCOPE. Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Structure Defense. 2013. Available online: <https://firescope.caloes.ca.gov/ICS%20Documents/WUI-SD.pdf> (accessed on 20 December 2025).
124. Filiberti, A.A.; Davis, S.C.; Spano, S.J. Smoke exposure and respirator use among wildland firefighters: A narrative review. *Wilderness Environ. Med.* **2025**, *36*, 405–415. [CrossRef]
125. Keir, J.L.A.; Papas, W.; Wawrzynczak, A.; Aranda-Rodriguez, R.; Blais, J.M.; White, P.A. Use of silicone wristbands to measure firefighters' exposures to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) during live fire training. *Environ. Res.* **2023**, *239*, 117306. [CrossRef]
126. Fent, K.W.; Mayer, A.C.; Toennis, C.; Sammons, D.; Robertson, S.; Chen, I.-C.; Bhandari, D.; Blount, B.C.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D.L. Firefighters' urinary concentrations of voc metabolites after controlled-residential and training fire responses. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* **2022**, *242*, 113969. [CrossRef]
127. Fent, K.W.; Toennis, C.; Sammons, D.; Robertson, S.; Bertke, S.; Calafat, A.M.; Pleil, J.D.; Wallace, M.A.G.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D.L. Firefighters' and instructors' absorption of PAHs and benzene during training exercises. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* **2019**, *222*, 991–1000. [CrossRef]
128. Fernando, S.; Shaw, L.; Shaw, D.; Gallea, M.; VandenEnden, L.; House, R.; Verma, D.K.; Britz-McKibbin, P.; McCarry, B.E. Evaluation of firefighter exposure to wood smoke during training exercises at burn houses. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2016**, *50*, 1536–1543. [CrossRef]
129. Kirk, K.M.; Logan, M.B. Exposures to air contaminants in compartment fire behavior training (cfbt) using particleboard fuel. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2019**, *16*, 432–439. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
130. Horn, G.P.; Kerber, S.; Lattz, J.; Kesler, R.M.; Smith, D.L.; Mayer, A.; Fent, K.W. Development of fireground exposure simulator (FES) prop for PPE testing and evaluation. *Fire Technol.* **2020**, *56*, 2331–2344. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
131. Fabian, T.; Borgerson, J.L.; Kerber, S.I.; Gandhi, P.D.; Baxter, C.S.; Ross, C.S.; Lockey, J.E.; Dalton, J.M. *Firefighter Exposure to Smoke Particulates*; Underwriters Laboratories: Northbrook, IL, USA, 2010.
132. Kirk, K.M.; Ridgway, M.; Logan, M.B. *Firefighter Exposures to Airborne Contaminants During Extinguishment of Simulated Residential Room Fires*; Research Report 2011-01; Queensland Fire and Rescue Service (QFRS) Scientific Branch: Beenleigh, QLD, Australia, 2011.
133. Jankovic, J.; Jones, W.; Burkhart, J.; Noonan, G. Environmental study of firefighters. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* **1991**, *35*, 581–602. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
134. Navarro, K.M.; Cisneros, R.; Schweizer, D.; Chowdhary, P.; Noth, E.M.; Balmes, J.R.; Hammond, S.K. Incident command post exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and particulate matter during a wildfire. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2019**, *16*, 735–744. [CrossRef]
135. Navarro, K.M.; Cisneros, R.; Noth, E.M.; Balmes, J.R.; Hammond, S.K. Occupational exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon of wildland firefighters at prescribed and wildland fires. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2017**, *51*, 6461–6469. [CrossRef]
136. Robinson, M.; Anthony, T.; Littau, S.; Herckes, P.; Nelson, X.; Poplin, G.; Burgess, J. Occupational PAH exposures during prescribed pile burns. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* **2008**, *52*, 497–508. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
137. Strandberg, B.; Julander, A.; Sjöström, M.; Lewné, M.; Akdeva, H.K.; Bigert, C. Evaluation of polyurethane foam passive air sampler (PUF) as a tool for occupational PAH measurements. *Chemosphere* **2018**, *190*, 35–42. [CrossRef]
138. Feunekes, F.; Jongeneelen, F.; Laana, H.; Schoonhof, F. Uptake of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons among trainers in a fire-fighting training facility. *Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J.* **1997**, *58*, 23–28. [CrossRef]

139. Banks, A.P.; Thai, P.; Engelsman, M.; Wang, X.; Osorio, A.F.; Mueller, J.F. Characterising the exposure of Australian firefighters to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons generated in simulated compartment fires. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health*. **2021**, *231*, 113637. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
140. Ruokojärvi, P.; Aatamila, M.; Ruuskanen, J. Toxic chlorinated and polyaromatic hydrocarbons in simulated house fires. *Chemosphere* **2000**, *41*, 825–828. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
141. Rosenfeld, P.E.; Spaeth, K.R.; Remy, L.L.; Byers, V.; Muerth, S.A.; Hallman, R.C.; Summers-Evans, J.; Barker, S. Perfluoroalkyl substances exposure in firefighters: Sources and implications. *Environ. Res.* **2023**, *220*, 115164. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
142. Maizel, A.C.; Thompson, A.; Tighe, M.; Veras, S.E.; Rodowa, A.E.; Falkenstein-Smith, R.; Benner, B.A.; Hoffman, K.; Donnelly, M.K.; Hernandez, O.; et al. *Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances in New Firefighter Turnout Gear Textiles*; National Institute of Standards and Technology: Gaithersburg, MD, USA; US Department of Commerce: Washington, DC, USA, 2023.
143. Hall, S.M.; Patton, S.; Petreas, M.; Zhang, S.; Phillips, A.L.; Hoffman, K.; Stapleton, H.M. Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances in dust collected from residential homes and fire stations in north america. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2020**, *54*, 14558–14567. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
144. Dobraca, D.; Israel, L.; McNeel, S.; Voss, R.; Wang, M.; Gajek, R.; Park, J.-S.; Harwani, S.; Barley, F.; She, J. Biomonitoring in california firefighters: Metals and perfluorinated chemicals. *J. Occup. Environ. Med.* **2015**, *57*, 88. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
145. Burgess, J.L.; Fisher, J.M.; Nematollahi, A.; Jung, A.M.; Calkins, M.M.; Graber, J.M.; Grant, C.C.; Beitel, S.C.; Littau, S.R.; Gulotta, J.J.; et al. Serum per- and polyfluoroalkyl substance concentrations in four municipal us fire departments. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* **2023**, *66*, 411–423. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
146. Mazumder, N.U.S.; Hossain, M.T.; Jahura, F.T.; Girase, A.; Hall, A.S.; Lu, J.T.; Ormond, R.B. Firefighters' exposure to per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) as an occupational hazard: A review. *Front. Mater.* **2023**, *10*, 1143411. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
147. Schöpel, M.; Jacobs, G.; Jordens, J.; van Ermen, G.; Voorspoels, S.; Krause, M. *Analytical Methods for PFAS in Products and the Environment*; Nordisk Ministerråd: Copenhagen, Denmark, 2022.
148. Gainey, S.J.; Horn, G.P.; Towers, A.E.; Oelschlager, M.L.; Tir, V.L.; Drnevich, J.; Fent, K.W.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D.L.; Freund, G.G. Exposure to a firefighting overhaul environment without respiratory protection increases immune dysregulation and lung disease risk. *PLoS ONE* **2018**, *13*, e0201830. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
149. Pleil, J.D.; Stiegel, M.A.; Fent, K.W. Exploratory breath analyses for assessing toxic dermal exposures of firefighters during suppression of structural burns. *J. Breath Res.* **2014**, *8*, 037107. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
150. Ireland, N.; Chen, Y.-H.; Tsai, C.S.-J. *Potential Penetration of Engineered Nanoparticles Under Practical Use of Protective Clothing Fabrics*; ACS Chemical Health & Safety: Washington, DC, USA, 2024. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
151. Roberts, M.; Jamriska, M.; Skvortsov, A.; McCallum, R. *Study on Aerosol Penetration Through Clothing and Individual Protective Equipment*; Human Protection and Performance Division, Defence Science and Technology Organisation: Fishermans Bend, VIC, Australia, 2009; pp. 1–39.
152. Cherry, N.; Aklilu, Y.-a.; Beach, J.; Britz-McKibbin, P.; Elbourne, R.; Galarneau, J.-M.; Gill, B.; Kinniburgh, D.; Zhang, X. Urinary 1-hydroxypyrene and skin contamination in firefighters deployed to the fort mcmurray fire. *Ann. Work Expo. Health* **2019**, *63*, 448–458. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
153. Alexander, B.M. *Contamination of Firefighter Personal Protective Gear*; University of Cincinnati: Cincinnati, OH, USA, 2012.
154. Sousa, G.; Teixeira, J.; Azevedo, R.; Almeida, A.; Delerue-Matos, C.; Morais, S.; Wang, X.; Rodrigues, F.; Freitas, M.; Oliveira, M. Gravimetric, morphological, and chemical characterization of fine and ultrafine particulate matter inside fire stations. *Build. Environ.* **2024**, *255*, 111403. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
155. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). *Compendium Method TO 13A: Determination of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) in Ambient Air Using Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry (GC/MS)*; EPA/625/R-96/010b; Center for Environmental Research Information, Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Cincinnati, OH, USA, 1999; 84p. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2019-11/documents/to-13arr.pdf> (accessed on 20 December 2025).
156. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). *Compendium Method TO-17: Determination of Volatile Organic Compounds in Ambient Air Using Active Sampling Onto Sorbent Tubes*; EPA/625/R-96/010b; Center for Environmental Research Information, Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Cincinnati, OH, USA, 1999; 53p. Available online: <https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2019-11/documents/to-17r.pdf> (accessed on 20 December 2025).
157. Baum, J.L.; Bakali, U.; Killawala, C.; Santiago, K.M.; Dikici, E.; Kobetz, E.N.; Solle, N.S.; Deo, S.; Bachas, L.; Daunert, S. Evaluation of silicone-based wristbands as passive sampling systems using PAHs as an exposure proxy for carcinogen monitoring in firefighters: Evidence from the firefighter cancer initiative. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* **2020**, *205*, 111100. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
158. Sen, P.; Calkins, M.; Stakes, K.; Neumann, D.L.; Chen, I.C.; Horn, G.P. Evaluation of passive silicone samplers compared to active sampling methods for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons during fire training. *Toxics* **2025**, *13*, 132. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
159. Bonner, E.M.; Poutasse, C.M.; Haddock, C.K.; Poston, W.S.C.; Jahnke, S.A.; Tidwell, L.G.; Anderson, K.A. Addressing the need for individual-level exposure monitoring for firefighters using silicone samplers. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.* **2025**, *35*, 180–195. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

160. Bakali, U.; Baum, J.L.R.; Killawala, C.; Kobetz, E.N.; Solle, N.S.; Deo, S.K.; Caban-Martinez, A.J.; Bachas, L.G.; Daunert, S. Mapping carcinogen exposure across urban fire incident response arenas using passive silicone-based samplers. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* **2021**, *228*, 112929. [[CrossRef](#)]
161. Hammel, S.C.; Hoffman, K.; Phillips, A.L.; Levasseur, J.L.; Lorenzo, A.M.; Webster, T.F.; Stapleton, H.M. Comparing the use of silicone wristbands, hand wipes, and dust to evaluate children's exposure to flame retardants and plasticizers. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2020**, *54*, 4484–4494. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
162. Gong, M.; Zhang, Y.; Weschler, C.J. Measurement of phthalates in skin wipes: Estimating exposure from dermal absorption. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2014**, *48*, 7428–7435. [[CrossRef](#)]
163. Paiva, A.M.; Barros, B.; Oliveira, M.; Alves, S.; Esteves, F.; Fernandes, A.; Vaz, J.; Slezáková, K.; Teixeira, J.P.; Costa, S.; et al. Biomonitoring of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons exposure and short-time health effects in wildland firefighters during real-life fire events. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2024**, *926*, 171801. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
164. Gill, B.; Britz-McKibbin, P. Biomonitoring of smoke exposure in firefighters: A review. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sci. Health* **2020**, *15*, 57–65. [[CrossRef](#)]
165. Engelsman, M.; Toms, L.-M.L.; Banks, A.P.; Wang, X.; Mueller, J.F. Biomonitoring in firefighters for volatile organic compounds, semivolatile organic compounds, persistent organic pollutants, and metals: A systematic review. *Environ. Res.* **2020**, *188*, 109562. [[CrossRef](#)]
166. Marín-Sáez, J.; López-Ruiz, R.; Liébanas, F.J.A.; Peralta, M.L.V.; Frenich, A.G. From flames to lab: A robust non-destructive sampling method for evaluating pah exposure in firefighters' personal protection equipment. *Microchem. J.* **2024**, *207*, 111909. [[CrossRef](#)]
167. Tysinger, P.M. Characterization of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in smoke produced from a preliminary small-scale live burn methodology. In *Textile Engineering*; North Carolina State University: Raleigh, NC, USA, 2024.
168. Andersson, J.T.; Achten, C. Time to say goodbye to the 16 EPA PAHs? Toward an up-to-date use of pacs for environmental purposes. *Polycycl. Aromat. Compd.* **2015**, *35*, 330–354. [[CrossRef](#)]
169. Wallace, M.A.G.; Pleil, J.D.; Oliver, K.D.; Whitaker, D.A.; Mentese, S.; Fent, K.W.; Horn, G.P. Targeted gc-ms analysis of firefighters' exhaled breath: Exploring biomarker response at the individual level. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2019**, *16*, 355–366. [[CrossRef](#)]
170. Geer Wallace, M.A.; Pleil, J.D.; Oliver, K.D.; Whitaker, D.A.; Mentese, S.; Fent, K.W.; Horn, G.P. Non-targeted gc/ms analysis of exhaled breath samples: Exploring human biomarkers of exogenous exposure and endogenous response from professional firefighting activity. *J. Toxicol. Environ. Health Part A* **2019**, *82*, 244–260. [[CrossRef](#)]
171. Kammer, R.; Tinnerberg, H.; Eriksson, K. Evaluation of a tape-stripping technique for measuring dermal exposure to pyrene and benzo(a)pyrene. *J. Environ. Monit.* **2011**, *13*, 2165–2171. [[CrossRef](#)]
172. Fent, K.W.; Jayaraj, K.; Gold, A.; Ball, L.M.; Nylander-French, L.A. Tape-strip sampling for measuring dermal exposure to 1, 6-hexamethylene diisocyanate. *Scand. J. Work. Environ. Health* **2006**, *32*, 225–231. [[CrossRef](#)]
173. Barros, B.; Oliveira, M.; Morais, S. Biomonitoring of firefighting forces: A review on biomarkers of exposure to health-relevant pollutants released from fires. *J. Toxicol. Environ. Health Part B* **2023**, *26*, 127–171. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
174. Oliveira, M.; Costa, S.; Vaz, J.; Fernandes, A.; Slezakova, K.; Delerue-Matos, C.; Teixeira, J.P.; Pereira, M.C.; Morais, S. Firefighters exposure to fire emissions: Impact on levels of biomarkers of exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and genotoxic/oxidative-effects. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2020**, *383*, 121179. [[CrossRef](#)]
175. Keir, J.L.A. The Use of Urinary Biomarkers to Assess Exposures to Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) and Other Organic Mutagens. Master's thesis, Université d'Ottawa/University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, Canada, 2017.
176. Jahnke, S.A.; Jitnarin, N.; Kaipust, C.M.; Hollerbach, B.S.; Naylor, B.M.; Crisp, C. *Fireground Exposure of Firefighters: A Literature Review*; NFPA: Quincy, MA, USA, 2021.
177. Wilkinson, A.F.; Kander, M.C.; Mayer, A.C.; Chen, I.C.; Kesler, R.M.; Masoud, F.; Smith, D.L.; Horn, G.P.; Fent, K.W. Use of undergloves to assess pathways leading to contamination on firefighters' hands. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2025**, *1*, 1–10. [[CrossRef](#)]
178. Carrico, C.M.; Prenni, A.J.; Kreidenweis, S.M.; Levin, E.J.T.; McCluskey, C.S.; DeMott, P.J.; McMeeking, G.R.; Nakao, S.; Stockwell, C.; Yokelson, R.J. Rapidly evolving ultrafine and fine mode biomass smoke physical properties: Comparing laboratory and field results. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* **2016**, *121*, 5750–5768. [[CrossRef](#)]
179. Cedeño Laurent, J.G.; Parhizkar, H.; Calderon, L.; Lizonova, D.; Tsiodra, I.; Mihalopoulos, N.; Kavouras, I.; Alam, M.; Baalousha, M.; Bazina, L.; et al. Physicochemical characterization of the particulate matter in new jersey/new york city area, resulting from the canadian quebec wildfires in june 2023. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2024**, *58*, 14753–14763. [[CrossRef](#)]
180. Austin, C.; Wang, D.; Ecobichon, D.J.; Dussault, G. Characterization of volatile organic compounds in smoke at municipal structural fires. *J. Toxicol. Environ. Health Part A* **2001**, *63*, 437–458. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
181. Navarro, K.M.; West, M.R.; O'Dell, K.; Sen, P.; Chen, I.C.; Fischer, E.V.; Hornbrook, R.S.; Apel, E.C.; Hills, A.J.; Jarnot, A.; et al. Exposure to particulate matter and estimation of volatile organic compounds across wildland firefighter job tasks. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2021**, *55*, 11795–11804. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]

182. Mayer, A.C.; Horn, G.P.; Fent, K.W.; Bertke, S.J.; Kerber, S.; Kesler, R.M.; Newman, H.; Smith, D.L. Impact of select PPE design elements and repeated laundering in firefighter protection from smoke exposure. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2020**, *17*, 505–514. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
183. Bakali, U.; Baum, J.L.; Louzado-Feliciano, P.; Killawala, C.; Santiago, K.M.; Pauley, J.L.; Dikici, E.; Solle, N.S.; Kobetz, E.N.; Bachas, L.G.; et al. Characterization of fire investigators' polyaromatic hydrocarbon exposures using silicone wristbands. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* **2024**, *278*, 116349. [[CrossRef](#)]
184. Levasseur, J.L.; Hoffman, K.; Herkert, N.J.; Cooper, E.; Hay, D.; Stapleton, H.M. Characterizing firefighter's exposure to over 130 SVOCs using silicone wristbands: A pilot study comparing on-duty and off-duty exposures. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2022**, *834*, 155237. [[CrossRef](#)]
185. Baxter, C.S.; Hoffman, J.D.; Knipp, M.J.; Reponen, T.; Haynes, E.N. Exposure of firefighters to particulates and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2014**, *11*, D85–D91. [[CrossRef](#)]
186. Bray, R.J.; Tretsiakova-McNally, S.; Zhang, J. The controlled atmosphere cone calorimeter: A literature review. *Fire Technol.* **2023**, *59*, 2203–2245. [[CrossRef](#)]
187. Sonnier, R.; Vahabi, H.; Chivas-Joly, C. New insights into the investigation of smoke production using a cone calorimeter. *Fire Technol.* **2019**, *55*, 853–873. [[CrossRef](#)]
188. Chatenet, S. *An Instrumented Controlled-Atmosphere Cone Calorimeter to Characterize Electrical Cable Behavior in Depleted Fires*; Université de Lille: Lille, France, 2019.
189. Barabad, M.L.M.; Jung, W.; Versoza, M.E.; Lee, Y.-i.; Choi, K.; Park, D. Characteristics of particulate matter and volatile organic compound emissions from the combustion of waste vinyl. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2018**, *15*, 1390. [[CrossRef](#)]
190. Wang, S.; Ding, P.; Lin, S.; Gong, J.; Huang, X. Smoldering and flaming of disc wood particles under external radiation: Autoignition and size effect. *Front. Mech. Eng.* **2021**, *7*, 686638. [[CrossRef](#)]
191. Goo, J. Study on the real-time size distribution of smoke particles for each fire stage by using a steady-state tube furnace method. *Fire Saf. J.* **2015**, *78*, 96–101. [[CrossRef](#)]
192. Blomqvist, P.; Hertzberg, T.; Tuovinen, H.; Arrhenius, K.; Rosell, L. Detailed determination of smoke gas contents using a small-scale controlled equivalence ratio tube furnace method. *Fire Mater. Int. J.* **2007**, *31*, 495–521. [[CrossRef](#)]
193. Guerrero, F.; Vidal, V.; Fadic, X.; Toledo, M.; Espinosa, D.; Cubillos, F.; Diaz, L.; Cereceda-Balic, F. Obtaining Emission Factors for PM_{2.5}, gases and particles size distribution generated from the combustion of Eucalyptus globulus and Nothofagus obliqua on ideal conditions using a controlled combustion chamber 3CE. In Proceedings of the A&WMA's 106th Annual Conference & Exhibition 2013, Chicago, IL, USA, 25–28 June 2013; Extended Abstract 2013-59796.
194. Singh, D.; Tasew, D.D.; Nelson, J.; Chalbot, M.C.G.; Kavouras, I.G.; Tesfaigzi, Y.; Demokritou, P. Physicochemical and toxicological properties of wood smoke particulate matter as a function of wood species and combustion condition. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2023**, *441*, 129874. [[CrossRef](#)]
195. Stec, A.A.; Rhodes, J. Bench scale generation of smoke particulates and hydrocarbons from burning polymers. *Fire Saf. Sci.* **2011**, *10*, 629–639. [[CrossRef](#)]
196. Stec, A.A.; Hull, T.R.; Lebek, K. Characterisation of the steady state tube furnace (ISO TS 19700) for fire toxicity assessment. *Polym. Degrad. Stab.* **2008**, *93*, 2058–2065. [[CrossRef](#)]
197. Babrauskas, V. The cone calorimeter. In *SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering*; Springer: London, UK, 2016; pp. 952–980.
198. Malmborg, V. Biomass burning emissions and influence of combustion variables in the cone-calorimeter. In Proceedings of the International Aerosol Conference 2022, Athens, Greece, 4–9 September 2022.
199. Mustafa, B.G. Particle size distribution during pine wood combustion on a cone calorimeter. In Proceedings of the Cambridge Particles Meeting 2017, Cambridge, UK, 23 June 2017.
200. ASTM E1354–22b; Standard Test Method for Heat and Visible Smoke Release Rates for Materials and Products Using an Oxygen Consumption Calorimeter. ASTM International: West Conshohocken, PA, USA, 2022. [[CrossRef](#)]
201. ISO 5660-1; Reaction-To-Fire Tests—Heat Release, Smoke Production and Mass Loss Rate, in Part 1: Heat Release Rate (Cone Calorimeter Method) and Smoke Production Rate (Dynamic Measurement). ISO: Geneva, Switzerland, 2015.
202. Reisen, F.; Meyer, C.P.; Weston, C.J.; Volkova, L. Ground-based field measurements of pm_{2.5} emission factors from flaming and smoldering combustion in eucalypt forests. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* **2018**, *123*, 8301–8314. [[CrossRef](#)]
203. Salvador, S.; Quintard, M.; David, C. Combustion of a substitution fuel made of cardboard and polyethylene: Influence of the mix characteristics—Experimental approach. *Fuel* **2004**, *83*, 451–462. [[CrossRef](#)]
204. ISO/TS 19700; Controlled Equivalence Ratio Method for the Determination of Hazardous Components of Fire Effluents — Steady-State Tube Furnace. ISO: Geneva, Switzerland, 2016.
205. Marsh, N.D.; Gann, R.G.; Nyden, M.R. *Smoke Component Yields from Bench-Scale Fire Tests: 2. ISO 19700 Controlled Equivalence Ratio Tube Furnace*; US Department of Commerce: Washington, DC, USA; National Institute of Standards and Technology: Gaithersburg, MD, USA, 2013.

206. Purser, J.A.; Purser, D.A.; Stec, A.A.; Moffatt, C.; Hull, T.R.; Su, J.Z.; Bijloos, M.; Blomquist, P. Repeatability and reproducibility of the ISO/TS 19700 steady state tube furnace. *Fire Saf. J.* **2013**, *55*, 22–34. [[CrossRef](#)]
207. Kim, Y.H.; Sinha, A.; George, I.J.; DeMarini, D.M.; Grieshop, A.P.; Gilmour, M.I. Toxicity of fresh and aged anthropogenic smoke particles emitted from different burning conditions. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2023**, *892*, 164778. [[CrossRef](#)]
208. Garg, P.; Wang, S.; Oakes, J.M.; Bellini, C.; Gollner, M.J. Variations in gaseous and particulate emissions from flaming and smoldering combustion of douglas fir and lodgepole pine under different fuel moisture conditions. *Combust. Flame* **2024**, *263*, 113386. [[CrossRef](#)]
209. Borucka, M. Analysis of flammability and smoke emission of plastic materials used in construction and transport. *Materials* **2023**, *16*, 2444. [[CrossRef](#)]
210. Burr, G.A.; Li, J.F. *Evaluation of Diesel Exhaust Exposure at Two Fire Stations*; National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health: Washington, DC, USA, 2017. [[CrossRef](#)]
211. Wolffe, T.A.M.; Clinton, A.; Robinson, A.; Turrell, L.; Stec, A.A. Contamination of uk firefighters personal protective equipment and workplaces. *Sci. Rep.* **2023**, *13*, 65. [[CrossRef](#)]
212. Krzemińska, S.; Szewczyńska, M. Analysis and assessment of hazards caused by chemicals contaminating selected items of firefighter personal protective equipment—A literature review. *Saf. Fire Technol.* **2020**, *56*, 92–109.
213. *Nfpa 1971*; Standard on Protective Ensembles for Structural Fire Fighting and Proximity Fire Fighting. NFPA: Quincy, MA, USA, 2018.
214. Lu, Y.; Song, G.; Li, J. Analysing performance of protective clothing upon hot liquid exposure using instrumented spray manikin. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* **2013**, *57*, 793–804. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
215. Ross, K.; Barker, R.; Deaton, A. Translation between heat loss measured using guarded sweating hot plate, sweating manikin, and physiologically assessed heat stress of firefighter turnout ensembles. In *Performance of Protective Clothing and Equipment: 9th Volume, Emerging Issues and Technologies*; ASTM International: Conshohocken, PA, USA, 2012.
216. Song, G.; Paskaluk, S.; Sati, R.; Crown, E.M.; Doug Dale, J.; Ackerman, M. Thermal protective performance of protective clothing used for low radiant heat protection. *Text. Res. J.* **2011**, *81*, 311–323. [[CrossRef](#)]
217. Su, Y.; Li, J.; Song, G. The effect of moisture content within multilayer protective clothing on protection from radiation and steam. *Int. J. Occup. Saf. Ergon.* **2018**, *24*, 190–199. [[CrossRef](#)]
218. Rosting, C.; Noto, H.P.; Ellingsen, D.G.; Johansen, T.H.; Olsen, R. Contamination of firefighters' merino wool and mixed fibre sweater and hood undergarments with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. *Ann. Work. Expo. Health* **2025**, *69*, wxaf031. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
219. Engelsman, M.; Snoek, M.F.; Banks, A.P.; Cantrell, P.; Wang, X.; Toms, L.-M.; Koppel, D.J. Exposure to metals and semivolatile organic compounds in australian fire stations. *Environ. Res.* **2019**, *179*, 108745. [[CrossRef](#)]
220. Banks, A.P.W.; Engelsman, M.; He, C.; Wang, X.; Mueller, J.F. The occurrence of PAHs and flame-retardants in air and dust from australian fire stations. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2020**, *17*, 73–84. [[CrossRef](#)]
221. Rogula-Kozłowska, W.; Bralewska, K.; Rogula-Kopiec, P.; Makowski, R.; Majder-Łopatka, M.; Łukawski, A.; Brandyk, A.; Majewski, G. Respirable particles and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons at two polish fire stations. *Build. Environ.* **2020**, *184*, 107255. [[CrossRef](#)]
222. Bai, H.; Qian, X.; Fan, J.; Shi, Y.; Duo, Y.; Guo, C.; Wang, X. Theoretical model of single fiber efficiency and the effect of microstructure on fibrous filtration performance: A review. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **2020**, *6*, 3–36. [[CrossRef](#)]
223. Al Assaad, D.; Ghali, K.; Ghaddar, N.; Shammass, E. Modeling of indoor particulate matter deposition to occupant typical wrinkled shirt surface. *Build. Environ.* **2020**, *179*, 106965. [[CrossRef](#)]
224. Wang, Y.; Fan, X.; Li, A.; Shang, L.; Wang, H. Deposition of fine particles on vertical textile surfaces: A small-scale chamber study. *Build. Environ.* **2018**, *135*, 308–317. [[CrossRef](#)]
225. Lai, A.C. Particle deposition and decay in a chamber and the implications to exposure assessment. *Water Air Soil Pollut.* **2006**, *175*, 323–334. [[CrossRef](#)]
226. Ranade, M. Adhesion and removal of fine particles on surfaces. *Aerosol Sci. Technol.* **1987**, *7*, 161–176. [[CrossRef](#)]
227. Ibrahim, A.; Dunn, P.; Brach, R. Microparticle detachment from surfaces exposed to turbulent air flow: Effects of flow and particle deposition characteristics. *J. Aerosol Sci.* **2004**, *35*, 805–821. [[CrossRef](#)]
228. Ibrahim, A.; Dunn, P.; Qazi, M. Experiments and validation of a model for microparticle detachment from a surface by turbulent air flow. *J. Aerosol Sci.* **2008**, *39*, 645–656. [[CrossRef](#)]
229. Friedlander, S. Particle diffusion in low-speed flows. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **1967**, *23*, 157–164. [[CrossRef](#)]
230. Gutfinger, C.; Friedlander, S. Enhanced deposition of suspended particles to fibrous surfaces from turbulent gas streams. *Aerosol Sci. Technol.* **1985**, *4*, 1–10. [[CrossRef](#)]
231. Nayak, R.; Ratnapandian, S. *Care and Maintenance of Textile Products Including Apparel and Protective Clothing*; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2018.
232. Hill, M.A.; Ghee, T.A.; Kaufman, J.; Dhaniyala, S. Investigation of aerosol penetration through individual protective equipment in elevated wind conditions. *Aerosol Sci. Technol.* **2013**, *47*, 705–713. [[CrossRef](#)]

233. Fent, K.W.; LaGuardia, M.; Luellen, D.; McCormick, S.; Mayer, A.; Chen, I.-C.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D.; Horn, G.P. Flame retardants, dioxins, and furans in air and on firefighters' protective ensembles during controlled residential firefighting. *Environ. Int.* **2020**, *140*, 105756. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
234. Gao, P.; Jaques, P.A.; Hsiao, T.-C.; Shepherd, A.; Eimer, B.C.; Yang, M.; Miller, A.; Gupta, B.; Shaffer, R. Evaluation of nano-and submicron particle penetration through ten nonwoven fabrics using a wind-driven approach. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2011**, *8*, 13–22. [[CrossRef](#)]
235. Licina, D.; Nazaroff, W. Clothing as a transport vector for airborne particles: Chamber study. *Indoor Air* **2018**, *28*, 404–414. [[CrossRef](#)]
236. Cho, M.; Jung, H.; Lee, H.; Lee, J. Simple formula for the non-uniform contaminant deposition on a cylindrical human body surrounded by porous clothing. *J. Mech. Sci. Technol.* **2016**, *30*, 1595–1601. [[CrossRef](#)]
237. Bell, K.F. *Measurement of the Deposition of Aerosol Particles to Skin, Hair and Clothing*; RISØ: Roskilde, Denmark, 1999.
238. Easter, E.; Lander, D.; Huston, T. Risk assessment of soils identified on firefighter turnout gear. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2016**, *13*, 647–657. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
239. Stull, J.O.; Dodgen, C.R.; Connor, M.B.; McCarthy, R.T. Evaluating the effectiveness of different laundering approaches for decontaminating structural fire fighting protective clothing. In *Performance of Protective Clothing: Fifth Volume*; ASTM International: Conshohocken, PA, USA, 1996.
240. Gagas, D.F. Characterization of Contaminants on Firefighter's Protective Equipment a Firefighter's Potential Exposure to Heavy Metals During a Structure Fire. Master's Thesis, Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, KY, USA, 2015.
241. Huston, T.N. Identification of Soils on Firefighter Turnout Gear from the Philadelphia Fire Department. Master's Thesis, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, USA, 2014.
242. Lao, J.-Y.; Wu, C.-C.; Bao, L.-J.; Liu, L.-Y.; Shi, L.; Zeng, E.Y. Size distribution and clothing-air partitioning of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons generated by barbecue. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2018**, *639*, 1283–1289. [[CrossRef](#)]
243. Rakowska, J.; Rachwał, M.; Walczak, A. Health exposure assessment of firefighters caused by PAHs in PM4 and TSP after firefighting operations. *Atmosphere* **2022**, *13*, 1263. [[CrossRef](#)]
244. Keir, J.L.; Akhtar, U.S.; Matschke, D.M.; Kirkham, T.L.; Chan, H.M.; Ayotte, P.; White, P.A.; Blais, J.M. Elevated exposures to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and other organic mutagens in ottawa firefighters participating in emergency, on-shift fire suppression. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2017**, *51*, 12745–12755. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
245. McDonagh, A.; Byrne, M. The influence of human physical activity and contaminated clothing type on particle resuspension. *J. Environ. Radioact.* **2014**, *127*, 119–126. [[CrossRef](#)]
246. McDonagh, A.; Byrne, M. A study of the size distribution of aerosol particles resuspended from clothing surfaces. *J. Aerosol Sci.* **2014**, *75*, 94–103. [[CrossRef](#)]
247. Ziskind, G.; Fichman, M.; Gutfinger, C. Resuspension of particulates from surfaces to turbulent flows—Review and analysis. *J. Aerosol Sci.* **1995**, *26*, 613–644. [[CrossRef](#)]
248. Tao, Y.; Inthavong, K.; Tu, J. Dynamic meshing modelling for particle resuspension caused by swinging manikin motion. *Build. Environ.* **2017**, *123*, 529–542. [[CrossRef](#)]
249. Zhou, X.; Dong, X.; Ma, R.; Wang, X.; Wang, F. Characterizing the partitioning behavior of formaldehyde, benzene and toluene on indoor fabrics: Effects of temperature and humidity. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2021**, *416*, 125827. [[CrossRef](#)]
250. Girase, A.; Shinde, A.; Ormond, R.B. Qualitative assessment of off-gassing of compounds from field-contaminated firefighter jackets with varied air exposure time intervals using headspace gc-ms. *Textiles* **2023**, *3*, 246–256. [[CrossRef](#)]
251. Helgesen, J. *Management and Decontamination of Firefighters Structural Protective Clothing and Equipment*; FEMA: Washington, DC, USA, 2010.
252. Qian, J.; Ferro, A.R.; Fowler, K.R. Estimating the resuspension rate and residence time of indoor particles. *J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.* **2008**, *58*, 502–516. [[CrossRef](#)]
253. Kim, K.-H.; Jahan, S.A.; Kabir, E.; Brown, R.J. A review of airborne polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and their human health effects. *Environ. Int.* **2013**, *60*, 71–80. [[CrossRef](#)]
254. Shen, B.; Whitehead, T.P.; McNeel, S.; Brown, F.R.; Dhaliwal, J.; Das, R.; Israel, L.; Park, J.-S.; Petreas, M. High levels of polybrominated diphenyl ethers in vacuum cleaner dust from california fire stations. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2015**, *49*, 4988–4994. [[CrossRef](#)]
255. Bates, B.; Hoque, M.S.; Munevar-Ortiz, L.; Batcheller, J.; Dolez, P.I. Effect of different laundering and drying procedures on the performance of fire-protective fabrics. *J. Polym. Sci.* **2025**, *63*, 3496–3508. [[CrossRef](#)]
256. Hoque, M.S.; Dolez, P.I. Aging of high-performance fibers used in firefighters' protective clothing: State of the knowledge and path forward. *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.* **2023**, *140*, e54255. [[CrossRef](#)]
257. Munevar-Ortiz, L.; Nychka, J.A.; Dolez, P.I. Moisture barriers used in firefighters' protective clothing: Effect of accelerated thermal aging on their mechanical and barrier performance. *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.* **2024**, *141*, e55548. [[CrossRef](#)]

258. Allen, J. *Investigation of Turnout Clothing Contamination and Validation of Cleaning Procedures—Phase 1*; Intertek Testing Services NA, Inc.: Cortland, NY, USA, 2017.
259. Tarley, J. *PPE Cleaning Validation: Supplement C: Investigation of Simulated Fire Ground Exposures*; NIOSH NPPTL: Washington, DC, USA, 2019.
260. Cereceda-Balic, F.; Toledo, M.; Vidal, V.; Guerrero, F.; Diaz-Robles, L.A.; Petit-Breuilh, X.; Lapuerta, M. Emission factors for PM_{2.5}, CO, CO₂, NO_x, SO₂ and particle size distributions from the combustion of wood species using a new controlled combustion chamber 3ce. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2017**, *584*, 901–910. [[CrossRef](#)]
261. Guerrero, F.; Yáñez, K.; Vidal, V.; Cereceda-Balic, F. Effects of wood moisture on emission factors for PM_{2.5}, particle numbers and particulate-phase PAHs from eucalyptus globulus combustion using a controlled combustion chamber for emissions. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2019**, *648*, 737–744. [[CrossRef](#)]
262. Wilson, A.L.; Cui, W.; Hu, Y.; Chiapasco, M.; Rein, G.; Porter, A.E.; Fowler, G.; Stettler, M.E.J. Particles emitted from smouldering peat: Size-resolved composition and emission factors. *Environ. Sci. Atmos.* **2025**, *5*, 348–366. [[CrossRef](#)]
263. Wilkinson, A.F.; Fent, K.W.; Mayer, A.C.; Chen, I.-C.; Kesler, R.M.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D.L.; Horn, G.P. Use of preliminary exposure reduction practices or laundering to mitigate polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon contamination on firefighter personal protective equipment ensembles. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2023**, *20*, 2108. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
264. Trojanowski, R.; Fthenakis, V. Nanoparticle emissions from residential wood combustion: A critical literature review, characterization, and recommendations. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **2019**, *103*, 515–528. [[CrossRef](#)]
265. Hansen, N.; Schenk, M.; Moshhammer, K.; Kohse-Höinghaus, K. Investigating repetitive reaction pathways for the formation of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in combustion processes. *Combust. Flame* **2017**, *180*, 250–261. [[CrossRef](#)]
266. Töpperwien, K.; Vignat, G.; Feinberg, A.J.; Daube, C.; Alton, M.W.; Fortner, E.C.; Canagaratna, M.R.; Kling, M.F.; Johnson, M.; Nadeau, K.; et al. Burn parameters affect pah emissions at conditions relevant for prescribed fires. *Atmos. Pollut. Res.* **2025**, *16*, 102438. [[CrossRef](#)]
267. Holder, A.L.; Sullivan, A.P. Emissions, chemistry, and the environmental impacts of wildland fire. *ACS EST Water* **2024**, *4*, 3614–3618. [[CrossRef](#)]
268. Shen, G.; Xue, M.; Wei, S.; Chen, Y.; Zhao, Q.; Li, B.; Wu, H.; Tao, S. Influence of fuel mass load, oxygen supply and burning rate on emission factor and size distribution of carbonaceous particulate matter from indoor corn straw burning. *J. Environ. Sci.* **2013**, *25*, 511–519. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
269. Sánchez, N.E.; Millera, Á.; Bilbao, R.; Alzueta, M.U. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH), soot and light gases formed in the pyrolysis of acetylene at different temperatures: Effect of fuel concentration. *J. Anal. Appl. Pyrolysis* **2013**, *103*, 126–133. [[CrossRef](#)]
270. Zhou, H.; Wu, C.; Meng, A.; Zhang, Y.; Williams, P.T. Effect of interactions of biomass constituents on polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) formation during fast pyrolysis. *J. Anal. Appl. Pyrolysis* **2014**, *110*, 264–269. [[CrossRef](#)]
271. Marquis, D.; Guillaume, E.; Camillo, A. Effects of oxygen availability on the combustion behaviour of materials in a controlled atmosphere cone calorimeter. In Proceedings of the Eleventh International Symposium on Fire Safety Science, Christchurch, New Zealand, 10–14 February 2014.
272. Forester, C.D.; Tarley, J. Effects of temperature and advanced cleaning practices on the removal of select organic chemicals from structural firefighter gear. *Fire Technol.* **2023**, *59*, 2127–2145. [[CrossRef](#)]
273. Girase, A.; Thompson, D.; Ormond, R.B. Bench-scale and full-scale level evaluation of the effect of parameters on cleaning efficacy of the firefighters' PPE. *Textiles* **2023**, *3*, 201–218. [[CrossRef](#)]
274. Shinde, A.; Ormond, R.B. Headspace sampling-gas chromatograph-mass spectrometer as a screening method to thermally extract fireground contaminants from retired firefighting turnout jackets. *Fire Mater.* **2021**, *45*, 415–428. [[CrossRef](#)]
275. Mitchell, J.; Hwang, J.; Larson, P.; Mandal, S.; Agnew, R.J. Preliminary analyses of accumulation of carcinogenic contaminants on retired firefighter ensembles. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2024**, *21*, 213–219. [[CrossRef](#)]
276. Kander, M.C.; Wilkinson, A.F.; Chen, I.C.; Bertke, S.; Kesler, R.M.; Smith, D.L.; Horn, G.P.; Fent, K.W. Evaluating the ingress of total polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) specifically naphthalene through firefighter hoods and base layers. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2025**, *22*, 169–177. [[CrossRef](#)]
277. Shen, G.; Wei, S.; Zhang, Y.; Wang, B.; Wang, R.; Shen, H.; Li, W.; Huang, Y.; Chen, Y.; Chen, H.; et al. Emission and size distribution of particle-bound polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from residential wood combustion in rural china. *Biomass Bioenergy* **2013**, *55*, 141–147. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
278. Billets, S. *A Literature Review of Wipe Sampling Methods for Chemical Warfare Agents and Toxic Industrial Chemicals*; US EPA: Washington, DC, USA, 2007.
279. Horn, G.P.; Fent, K.W.; Kerber, S.; Smith, D.L. Hierarchy of contamination control in the fire service: Review of exposure control options to reduce cancer risk. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2022**, *19*, 538–557. [[CrossRef](#)]
280. Stolpman, D.; Williams, D.N.; Solouki, T.; Harris, D.D. Decontamination of metals from firefighter turnout gear. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2021**, *19*, 79–86. [[CrossRef](#)]

281. Szmytko, E.; Brzezińska, D.; Machnowski, W.; Kokot, S. Firefighters' protective clothing—Water cleaning method vs. liquid co method in aspect of efficiency. *Archit. Civ. Eng. Environ.* **2022**, *15*, 169–176. [CrossRef]
282. Calvillo, A.; Haynes, E.; Burkle, J.; Schroeder, K.; Calvillo, A.; Reese, J.; Reponen, T. Pilot study on the efficiency of water-only decontamination for firefighters' turnout gear. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2019**, *16*, 199–205. [CrossRef]
283. Laughlin, J.; Gold, R.E. Water hardness, detergent type, and prewash product use as factors affecting methyl parathion residue retained in protective apparel fabrics. *Cloth. Text. Res. J.* **1990**, *8*, 61–67. [CrossRef]
284. Krzemińska, S.M. Effects of washing conditions on pah removal effectiveness in firefighter protective clothing materials. *Materials* **2025**, *18*, 4073. [CrossRef]
285. Girase, A.; Thompson, D.; Ormond, R.B. Comparative analysis of the liquid CO₂ washing with conventional wash on firefighters' personal protective equipment (PPE). *Textiles* **2022**, *2*, 624–632. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
286. Hossain, M.T.; Girase, A.G.; Ormond, R.B. Evaluating the performance of surfactant and charcoal-based cleaning products to effectively remove PAHs from firefighter gear. *Front. Mater.* **2023**, *10*, 207. [CrossRef]
287. Aslanidou, D.; Karapanagiotis, I.; Panayiotou, C. Tuneable textile cleaning and disinfection process based on supercritical CO₂ and pickering emulsions. *J. Supercrit. Fluids* **2016**, *118*, 128–139. [CrossRef]
288. Farcas, D.; Blachere, F.M.; Kashon, M.L.; Sbarra, D.; Schwegler-Berry, D.; Stull, J.O.; Noti, J.D. Survival of staphylococcus aureus on the outer shell of fire fighter turnout gear after sanitation in a commercial washer/extractor. *J. Occup. Med. Toxicol.* **2019**, *14*, 10. [CrossRef]
289. Sorbo, N.W. *Firefighter Turnout Gear SVOC Cleaning Efficiency of CO₂-Based Cleaning Process Compared to Traditional Water-Based Cleaning Methods*; Cool Clean Technologies, LLC: Eagan, MN, USA, 2020. Available online: <https://etdecon.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/NFPASVOCCleaningEfficacyComparisionCO2vsWaterWash-20201015Final.pdf> (accessed on 20 December 2025).
290. Rezazadeh, M.; Torvi, D.A. Assessment of factors affecting the continuing performance of firefighters' protective clothing: A literature review. *Fire Technol.* **2011**, *47*, 565–599. [CrossRef]
291. Wang, L.; He, J.; Lu, Y.; Jiang, S.; Wang, M. Interaction effects of washing and abrasion on thermal protective performance of flame-retardant fabrics. *Int. J. Occup. Saf. Ergon.* **2018**, *27*, 86–94. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
292. Salmi, R.; Laitinen, J. Evaluation of the decontamination methods for turnout gear. *J. Occup. Environ. Hyg.* **2025**, *3*, 1–17. [CrossRef]
293. Lucena, M.A.; Zapata, F.; Mauricio, F.G.M.; Ortega-Ojeda, F.E.; Quintanilla-López, M.G.; Weber, I.T.; Montalvo, G. Evaluation of an ozone chamber as a routine method to decontaminate firefighters' PPE. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2021**, *18*, 10587. [CrossRef]
294. Product Safety Commission (AfPS). *AfPS GS 2019:01 PAK: GS Specification: Testing and Assessment of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) in the Awarding of GS Marks (Specification pursuant to Article 21 (1) No. 3 of the Product Safety Act (ProdSG))*; Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (BAuA): Dortmund, Germany, 2020. Available online: https://www.baua.de/DE/Aufgaben/Geschaefsfuehrung-von-Ausschuessen/AfPS/pdf/AfPS-GS-2019-01-PAK-EN.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=5%2F1000 (accessed on 20 December 2025).
295. Aranda-Rodriguez, R.; Piperakis, A.; Papas, W.; Fantin, E.; White, P.A. Profiles of per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances in firefighter turnout gear and their impact on exposure assessment. *Environ. Sci. Process. Impacts* **2025**, *27*, 3586–3594. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
296. DeBono, N.L.; Daniels, R.D.; Freeman, L.E.B.; Graber, J.M.; Hansen, J.; Teras, L.R.; Driscoll, T.; Kjaerheim, K.; Demers, P.A.; Glass, D.C.; et al. Firefighting and cancer: A meta-analysis of cohort studies in the context of cancer hazard identification. *Saf. Health Work* **2023**, *14*, 141–152. [CrossRef]
297. Pukkala, E.; Martinsen, J.I.; Weiderpass, E.; Kjaerheim, K.; Lynge, E.; Tryggvadottir, L.; Sparén, P.; Demers, P.A. Cancer incidence among firefighters: 45 years of follow-up in five nordic countries. *Occup. Environ. Med.* **2014**, *71*, 398–404. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
298. Soteriades, E.S.; Smith, D.L.; Tsismenakis, A.J.; Baur, D.M.; Kales, S.N. Cardiovascular disease in us firefighters: A systematic review. *Cardiol. Rev.* **2011**, *19*, 202–215. [CrossRef]
299. Chen, H.; Samet, J.M.; Bromberg, P.A.; Tong, H. Cardiovascular health impacts of wildfire smoke exposure. *Part. Fibre Toxicol.* **2021**, *18*, 2. [CrossRef]
300. Smith, D.L.; DeBlois, J.P.; Kales, S.N.; Horn, G.P. Cardiovascular strain of firefighting and the risk of sudden cardiac events. *Exerc. Sport Sci. Rev.* **2016**, *44*, 90–97. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
301. Gaughan, D.M.; Siegel, P.D.; Hughes, M.D.; Chang, C.Y.; Law, B.F.; Campbell, C.R.; Richards, J.C.; Kales, S.F.; Chertok, M.; Kobzik, L.; et al. Arterial stiffness, oxidative stress, and smoke exposure in wildland firefighters. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* **2014**, *57*, 748–756. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
302. Barbosa, J.V.; Branco, P.; Alvim-Ferraz, M.C.M.; Martins, F.G.; Sousa, S.I.V. Firefighters' occupational exposure to air pollution: Impact on copd and asthma—Study protocol. *BMJ Open Respir. Res.* **2024**, *11*, e001951. [CrossRef]
303. Wah, W.; Gelaw, A.; Glass, D.C.; Sim, M.R.; Hoy, R.F.; Berecki-Gisolf, J.; Walker-Bone, K. Systematic review of impacts of occupational exposure to wildfire smoke on respiratory function, symptoms, measures and diseases. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* **2025**, *263*, 114463. [CrossRef]
304. Lim, J.-E.; Kang, H.; Lee, J.; Kim, S.; Bae, M.; Moon, H.-B.; Choi, K.; Kim, C.; Kim, K.-T. Urinary concentrations of organophosphate esters and associated health outcomes in korean firefighters. *Chemosphere* **2023**, *339*, 139641. [CrossRef]

305. Hoppe-Jones, C.; Griffin, S.C.; Gulotta, J.J.; Wallentine, D.D.; Moore, P.K.; Beitel, S.C.; Flahr, L.M.; Zhai, J.; Zhou, J.J.; Littau, S.R. Evaluation of fireground exposures using urinary pah metabolites. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.* **2021**, *31*, 913–922. [[CrossRef](#)]
306. Hwang, J.; Xu, C.; Grunsted, P.; Agnew, R.J.; Malone, T.R.; Clifton, S.; Thompson, K.; Xu, X. Urinary metabolites of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in firefighters: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2022**, *19*, 8475. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.