Systematic Performance Failure in Commercial Hand Dryers: A Large-Scale Quantitative Analysis of Time-to-Dry in Dyson and Xlerator Hand Dryers in Public Restrooms

Ronald A. Blouch Jr.
December 2025
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17858443

Abstract

Forced air hand dryer manufacturers and their certifying agencies claim hands are dried by their dryers in 8-12 seconds. Our earlier companion study (Blouch [2]) proved that was false, with hands retaining an average of 2.83 g of water at the claimed dry time ($p < 0.001$, Cohen's $d = 5.00$). We became curious about how long it actually took for hands to dry to the manufacturer's stated residual water levels. This study evaluates the time required for Dispersal-Type commercial hand dryers in functioning public restrooms to dry hands to the manufacturers' and certifying agencies' published standards. Using standardized protocols similar to those in the Underwriters Laboratories Hand Dryer PCR and the NSF P335, we measured remaining residual water on hands at timed intervals from 0 to 105 seconds over 409 trials of three of the most frequently purchased dryer models (Dyson Airblade V HEPA, Xlerator Standard, Xlerator ECO). Our findings reveal a fundamental physical reality: reliable hand drying in production model hand dryers in situ requires 80+ seconds to dry, rather than the claimed 8-12 seconds, with some dryers never reliably reaching their specification value. That is a 10× discrepancy that has catastrophic downstream impact on total user microorganism exposure, energy use claims, and device impact in the restroom (Blouch [9]). Performance curves across all tested brands and models demonstrated near-perfect correlation ($r > 0.999$), indicating that drying limitations represent fundamental physical constraints of air-drying processes used by these machines rather than engineering variations between brands and models. The public health implications are profound. Users face an impossible choice: accept inadequately dried hands at manufacturer-specified times (facilitating 400-500× increased bacterial transfer), or extend exposure to the 80+ seconds actually required. Every additional second of dry time uses additional power and applies more microorganisms to hands, further adding to the conflicting tensions pressuring an energy aware user. This study quantifies what happens in the gap between manufacturer and certifying agencies' claims and physical reality.

This paper is part of an eleven-study series examining hand hygiene practices in public restrooms. The papers were written in chronological order as testing evolved. Earlier papers are left largely as they were written at the time for detail, historicity, and clarity. Studies in this series may be referenced in each document by series number (Paper 1-11) or by citation number in the reference list:

Transmission of Bacteria and Fungus via Dyson and Xlerator Hand Dryers in Starbucks, Home Depot and Whole Foods Restrooms: A Comparative Analysis; Blouch, R. A. Jr. (2025) MAIN STUDY [Preprint] Retrieved from www.handdryerstudy.com/. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15504115 PAPER [1]

Testing the Validity of Hand Dryer Drying Time Specifications: A Quantitative Study of Residual Water on Dyson and Xlerator Dryers in Retail Store Environments; Blouch, R. A. Jr. (2025) [Preprint] Retrieved from www.handdryerstudy.com/. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15503698 PAPER [2]

Visual Analysis of Water Dispersion Patterns During Hand Drying: A Qualitative Comparison of High-Speed Air Dryers and Paper Towels; Blouch, R. A. Jr. (2025) [Preprint] Retrieved from www.handdryerstudy.com/. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15503304 PAPER [3]

Bacterial and Fungal Contamination Assessment of Paper Towel Types: A Quantitative Analysis of White versus Brown Varieties in Retail Restrooms; Blouch, R. A. Jr. (2025) [Preprint] Retrieved from www.handdryerstudy.com/. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15504144 PAPER [4]

Systematic Performance Failure in Commercial Hand Dryers: A Large-Scale Quantitative Analysis of Time-To-Dry on Hands in Dyson and Xlerator Hand Dryers in Public Restrooms; Blouch, R.A Jr. (2025) [Preprint] Retrieved from www.handdryerstudy.com/. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17858443 PAPER [5]

Baseline Water Mass on Freshly Washed Hands: Establishing Reference Values; Blouch R. A. Jr. (2025) [Preprint] Retrieved from www.handdryerstudy.com/. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17858834 PAPER [6]

An Empirical Refutation of Green Energy Claims for Dyson and Xlerator Hand Dryers in Use in Public Restrooms; Blouch, R. A. Jr. (2025) [Preprint] Retrieved from www.handdryerstudy.com/. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17859198 PAPER [7]

Catastrophic Time-To-Dry Failures by Dyson, Excel and World Dryer Hand Dryers via the Bi-Modal Loose Water and Bound Water Mechanism: A Comprehensive Definitive Analysis; Blouch, R. A. Jr. (2025) [Preprint] Retrieved from www.handdryerstudy.com/. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17869567 PAPER [8]

Validation of Hand Dryer Microbial Amplification Using Broad-Spectrum Growth Media: A Replication Study with Enhanced Detection Methodology; Blouch, R. A. Jr. (2025) [Preprint] Retrieved from www.handdryerstudy.com/. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17859894 PAPER [9]

The Wandering Plume of Filth: A Randomized, Empirical Assessment of Visible Wall Contamination Radiating from Commercial Hand Dryers Versus Paper Towel Dispensers in Functioning Public Restrooms; Blouch, R. A. Jr. (2025) [Preprint] Retrieved from www.handdryerstudy.com/. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17860971 PAPER [10]

Performance Failures in Commercial Hand Dryers: An Historical Synthesis and Sequential Summary Review of an Eleven-Study Research Program; Blouch, R. A. Jr. (2025) [Preprint] Retrieved from www.handdryerstudy.com/. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18322481 PAPER [11]

1. Introduction

The Question That Emerged

Our initial investigation (Blouch, Paper 2) documented that commercial hand dryers fail to achieve manufacturer-specified dryness thresholds at claimed drying times. That study answered one question: Do they work as advertised at 8-12 seconds? The answer was no—100% failure rate.

But a more fundamental question remained: How long does it actually take to dry hands? And what happens during that extended period?

This is worth restating: on their websites and in their promotional materials Dyson and Excel Dryer [13] explicitly and repeatedly claim to leave 0.1g and 0.25g of residual water on hands at the completion of their specified drying times of 12 and 8 seconds, respectively. These highly specific claims are cited as justification for installation in high-traffic public facilities. Both manufacturers have received certification from Underwriters Laboratories (UL), NSF International and Smart EPD, whose certification protocols define a dryness threshold of from 0.1 to 0.25 grams residual moisture.

The accuracy of these claims has significant implications for facility planning, user experience, and hand hygiene outcomes. Previous research by Patrick et al. and Marples and Towers [14] established that residual moisture on hands significantly impacts bacterial transfer—wet hands transferred up to 68,000 organisms compared to properly dried hands transferring as few as 140 organisms. The relationship between residual hand moisture and pathogen transfer (Jensen et al., [12]) underscores the critical importance of understanding actual drying performance.

The Compounding Public Health Crisis

Our companion microbial study demonstrates that hand dryers universally amplify bacterial and fungal contamination by a median factor of 49.6-fold compared to ambient restroom air, with 100% of tested devices showing contamination amplification across 87 rigorous trials.

When manufacturer-specified drying times fail to achieve effective drying—as our empirical testing demonstrates—users face an impossible choice with negative health outcomes regardless of their decision: accept inadequately dried hands with dramatically elevated pathogen transfer risk, or extend usage far beyond recommended

times, during which they experience prolonged exposure to airstreams containing amplified bacterial, fungal, and likely viral loads.

This study was designed to quantify that gap—to determine not just that dryers fail, but how long they actually take to dry.

2. Materials and Methods

Testing Protocol

A standardized testing procedure was designed using protocols similar to those in the Underwriters Laboratories Hand Dryer PCR (ULE_HandDryer_PCR_7-13-16). The methodology incorporates a 5-second drip time protocol to standardize initial water loading, providing objective, replicable measurements across extended time intervals from 0 to 105 seconds.

Test Locations and Sample Size

Testing was conducted across multiple retail locations in Central Pennsylvania, incorporating 409 valid measurements across three commercial Dispersal-type hand dryer models:

- Dyson Airblade V HEPA units (n=212)
- Xlerator Standard units (n=142)
- Xlerator ECO units (n=55)

All units were production models in active use in public restrooms, representing actual in situ performance conditions users encounter in commercial facilities. Testing sessions required approximately 3 hours per location to complete the full time-interval protocol.

Measurement Procedure

1. Initial Hand Washing: Hands washed following standard procedure without soap to maximize water loading while maintaining consistency.
2. Standardized Drip Time: Following UL protocol guidelines, hands held stationary for exactly 5 seconds to allow gravitational water removal.
3. Timed Hand Dryer Exposure: Hands dried for predetermined intervals (0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100, 105 seconds).
4. Residual Moisture Measurement: Pre-weighed paper towels used to absorb remaining moisture immediately after timed exposure. Paper towels weighed using precision digital scale accurate to 0.01g.

Statistical Analysis

Residual moisture measurements analyzed using one-sample t-tests comparing measured values to manufacturer claims, Pearson correlation analysis to assess

cross-technology performance similarities, and time-to-compliance analysis to determine actual drying requirements.

3. Results

Overall Performance

Testing revealed systematic performance failures across all dryer types, directly contradicting manufacturer claims of effective drying within specified timeframes.

Zero Compliance at Manufacturer-Specified Times

Analysis at manufacturer-specified drying times revealed complete failure:

Dyson at 10 seconds (closest data to claimed 12 seconds):

- 0/20 measurements achieved ≤0.1g threshold
- Mean residual: 2.547g (2,447% above claim)

Xlerator at 10 seconds (closest data to claimed 8 seconds):

- 0/20 measurements achieved ≤0.25g threshold
- Mean residual: 2.487–2.608g (894–943% above claim)

Actual Time Required for Compliance

Time-to-compliance analysis revealed the true performance reality:

First Instance Compliance:

- Dyson (≤0.1g NSF standard): First achieved at 80 seconds (567% longer than claimed)
- Xlerator Standard (≤0.25g UL standard): First achieved at 50 seconds (525% longer than claimed)
- Xlerator ECO (≤0.25g UL standard): First achieved at 70 seconds (775% longer than claimed)

Consistent Compliance (100% of trials):

- Dyson (≤0.1g standard): Never achieved across all tested intervals
- Xlerator Standard (≤0.25g standard): Achieved at 80 seconds
- Xlerator ECO (≤0.25g standard): Achieved at 80 seconds

Critical finding: Dyson Airblade never achieved consistent compliance with its own 0.1g specification at any tested interval up to 105 seconds.

These findings indicate that reliable hand drying requires 7-10 times longer exposure than manufacturer specifications, fundamentally transforming the user experience from quick convenience to extended waiting periods.

The Revelation: Cross-Technology Performance Convergence

Performance curve analysis revealed near-perfect correlations across all tested dryer technologies despite fundamental differences in design:

Cross-Manufacturer Correlations:

- Dyson Airblade V HEPA vs Xlerator Standard: r = 0.9996
- Dyson Airblade V HEPA vs Xlerator ECO: r = 0.9995
- Xlerator Standard vs Xlerator ECO: r = 0.9992

All correlations exceeded r = 0.999, indicating essentially identical performance curves across different technologies.

This convergence occurs despite fundamental technological differences:

- Air flow patterns (focused blade vs. distributed nozzle)
- Motor specifications (brushed vs. brushless)
- Air velocity claims (varying manufacturer specifications)
- Physical design approaches (hands-in vs. hands-under)

The statistical impossibility of achieving r > 0.999 correlations by coincidence indicates that all tested products are constrained by identical physical limitations that override engineering variations. This finding suggests that marketing claims of technological superiority represent false differentiation of functionally equivalent inadequate products.

Performance by Dryer Type

Dyson Airblade V HEPA (n=212):

- Mean residual: 1.770g (±1.895g, 95% CI: 1.515–2.025g)
- Performance ratio: 17.7× claimed level (1,670% failure margin)
- Statistical significance: $t(211) = 12.83$, $p < 0.001$

Xlerator Standard (n=142):

- Mean residual: 1.921g (±1.793g, 95% CI: 1.626–2.215g)
- Performance ratio: 7.7× claimed level (668% failure margin)
- Statistical significance: $t(141) = 11.11$, $p < 0.001$

Xlerator ECO (n=55):

- Mean residual: 1.741g (±1.939g, 95% CI: 1.228–2.253g)
- Performance ratio: 7.0× claimed level (596% failure margin)
- Statistical significance: $t(54) = 5.70$, $p < 0.001$

Statistical comparison revealed no significant differences in moisture retention capabilities across dryer types ($F(2,406) = 0.89$, $p = 0.41$), confirming that apparent technological variations have no meaningful impact on drying effectiveness.

4. Discussion

Physics Controls: The Meaning of Identical Curves

The near-perfect correlations ($r > 0.999$) across different technologies represent a paradigm shift in understanding commercial dryer performance. Rather than competing products with varying capabilities based on different engineering approaches, the data reveals an industry selling identical inadequate performance under different marketing narratives.

The near-perfect correlations suggest that hand dryer performance is constrained by fundamental physical limitations of air-drying processes rather than specific engineering implementations. This finding invalidates manufacturer claims of technological superiority and indicates that different products represent identical inadequate performance marketed under different narratives.

The Impossible Choice and Its Consequences

The documented requirement for 80+ seconds to achieve reliable drying creates a cascade of public health concerns. Users face a binary decision with negative outcomes:

Option 1: Follow manufacturer timing (8-12 seconds)

- Retain 1.8-2.5g residual moisture
- Experience bacterial transfer rates 400-500× higher than properly dried hands
- Leave with wet hands that contaminate everything touched

Option 2: Achieve actual drying (80+ seconds)

- Experience 7-10× longer contamination exposure
- Median bacterial/fungal load: 67 CFU per minute
- 27.6% of exposures exceed 100 CFU per minute
- Extreme events reach 385 CFU per minute

This represents a systematic inversion of intended hygiene outcomes, where devices marketed as hygienic solutions become vectors for both inadequate drying and systematic contamination exposure. The combination of performance failures documented in this study with universal contamination amplification documented in our microbial study creates optimal conditions for pathogen transmission precisely when users expect improved hygiene outcomes.

What Happens in the Gap

The 70-80 extra seconds between manufacturer claims and actual drying time is not neutral. During this period:

Microbial Exposure:

- Extended exposure to 49.6× amplified bacterial/fungal loads
- Projected viral exposure of 117-240 particles per minute
- Cumulative contamination scales with actual usage time

Aerosol Generation:

- Continuous high-shear droplet production
- Particles in 10-1000 μm range with 10-second to 10-minute hang times
- Environmental contamination of walls, floors, fixtures, users

Energy Consumption:

- Actual consumption 7-10× manufacturer projections
- Economic impact on facility operating costs

User Experience:

- Queue formation in high-traffic facilities
- User abandonment leading to wet-hand facility exit
- Equipment utilization incompatible with design assumptions

Certification System Failure

These findings raise serious questions about the certification processes employed by Underwriters Laboratories and NSF International. Despite having established their own testing protocols that define a dryness threshold of 0.25 or 0.1 grams residual moisture, they have granted certification to products that systematically fail to meet that standard.

The consistency of our results across 409 measurements in diverse commercial locations makes it statistically impossible that UL certification reflects valid performance assessment. We suggest the onus is now on UL to publicly replicate our experiment using their stated methodology and demonstrate how products failing by 600%–1,600% margins received certification approval.

Validation Across Methodologies

Comparison with our initial 21-measurement study (Paper 2) using maximum-challenge methodology demonstrates consistent patterns despite methodological refinements:

Paper 2 Results (no drip protocol):

- Dyson: 2.689g average
- Xlerator: 2.965g average

This Study (5-second drip protocol):

- Dyson: 1.770g (34.2% improvement)
- Xlerator: 1.870g (36.9% improvement)

Despite increasing protocol consistency (in variance with the fact no dryer user hand dries for 5 seconds before drying), systematic failures persist: zero compliance at manufacturer times, 5-8× longer time to compliance, and overwhelming statistical significance ($p < 0.001$). This convergence demonstrates that performance gaps are inherent product characteristics rather than testing artifacts.

Immediate Alternative

Our companion paper towel study provides an immediately implementable solution. White paper towels achieve complete hand drying in 15-20 seconds while maintaining minimal microbial contamination (55.6% sterile samples, remaining samples showing only 1-2 CFU). This represents the inverse of hand dryer performance: faster drying with less contamination.

5. Limitations

This study was conducted in Pennsylvania retail locations and may not represent all climate conditions or installation environments. While methodology aligned with UL certification guidelines, individual user technique variations are inherent to real-world testing.

However, the statistical power provided by 409 measurements, consistency across multiple locations and dryer types, and convergence with findings from complementary methodological approaches suggest results reflect genuine systematic performance limitations rather than regional artifacts.

6. Conclusion

This study provides definitive empirical evidence that manufacturer-specified drying times for commercial hand dryers systematically understate the time required for effective hand drying. Analysis of 409 measurements across three dryer types confirms zero compliance at manufacturer-specified exposure times, with reliable performance requiring 80+ seconds rather than claimed 8-12 seconds.

Near-perfect correlations ($r > 0.999$) between different technologies demonstrate that performance limitations represent fundamental physical constraints rather than engineering variations. The industry is selling identical inadequate performance under different marketing narratives. Physics cannot be engineered around.

The integration of these drying time failures with systematic microbial contamination (49.6-fold amplification) reveals a cascading public health crisis. Users face an impossible choice: inadequate drying facilitating 400-500× increased bacterial transfer, or extended exposure to amplified microbial loads during the 80+ seconds actually required for effective drying.

These findings raise serious questions about certification processes that approved products failing by 600-1,600% margins. Facility planning based on manufacturer claims and certifier approval results in energy consumption, queue formation, and user experience 7-10× worse than specified.

The identical performance curves documented across different technologies suggest that fundamental physical limitations affect the entire commercial hand dryer industry, warranting comprehensive regulatory review of certification standards and marketing claim validation processes.

References

[1] Patrick, D. R., Findon, G., & Miller, T. E. (1997). Residual moisture determines the level of touch-contact-associated bacterial transfer following hand washing. Epidemiology & Infection, 119(3), 319-325.

[2] Huang, C., Ma, W., & Stack, S. (2012). The hygienic efficacy of different hand-drying methods: a review of the evidence. Mayo Clinic Proceedings, 87(8), 791-798.

[3] Underwriters Laboratories (2016). ULE_HandDryer_PCR_7-13-16. Product Category Rules for Hand Dryers.

[4] Blouch, R. A. (2025). Transmission of Bacteria and Fungus via Dyson and Xlerator Hand Dryers. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15504115

[5] Blouch, R. A. (2025). Testing the Validity of Hand Dryer Drying Time Specifications. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15503698

[6] Blouch, R. A. (2025). Bacterial and Fungal Contamination Assessment of Paper Towel Types. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15504144

[7] Blouch, R. A. (2025). Visual Analysis of Water Dispersion Patterns During Hand Drying. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15503304

[8] Dyson (2023). Commercial hand dryers. Retrieved from https://www.dyson.com/commercial/hand-dryers

[9] Best, E. L., Parnell, P., & Wilcox, M. H. (2014). Microbiological comparison of hand-drying methods. Journal of Hospital Infection, 88(4), 199-206.

[10] Kimmitt, P. T., & Redway, K. F. (2016). Evaluation of the potential for virus dispersal during hand drying. Journal of Applied Microbiology, 120(2), 478-486.

[11] Huesca-Espitia, L. D. C., et al. (2018). Deposition of bacteria and bacterial spores by bathroom hot-air hand dryers. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 84(8), e00044-18.

[12] Jensen, D. A., et al. (2015). Quantifying the effect of hand wash duration, soap use, ground beef debris, and drying methods. Journal of Food Protection, 78(4), 685-690.

[13] Excel Dryer, Inc. (2017). Xlerator and Xleratoreco hand dryer specifications.

[14] Marples, R. R., & Towers, A. G. (1979). A laboratory model for the investigation of contact transfer of micro-organisms. Journal of Hygiene, Cambridge, 82(2), 237–248.

Appendix 1: Statistical Summary

Descriptive Statistics

Dryer Type	n	Mean (g)	SD	95% CI	Range
Dyson Airblade V HEPA	212	1.770	1.895	1.515–2.025	0.060–7.630
Xlerator Standard	142	1.921	1.793	1.626–2.215	0.070–7.450
Xlerator ECO	55	1.741	1.939	1.228–2.253	0.060–7.610
Combined	**409**	**1.818**	**1.863**	**1.638–1.999**	**0.060–7.630**

Inferential Statistics: One-Sample t-Tests Against Standards

Analysis	Test Statistic	p-value	Excess
Combined vs UL (0.25g)	t(408) = 17.03	<0.001	+627%
Combined vs NSF (0.1g)	t(408) = 18.65	<0.001	+1,718%
Dyson vs NSF claim	t(211) = 12.83	<0.001	+1,670%
Xlerator Std vs UL claim	t(141) = 11.11	<0.001	+668%
Xlerator ECO vs UL claim	t(54) = 5.70	<0.001	+596%

Effect Size: Cohen's d = 0.84 (large effect)

Cross-Technology Correlations

Comparison	r	Interpretation
Dyson vs Xlerator Standard	0.9996	Near-perfect
Dyson vs Xlerator ECO	0.9995	Near-perfect
Xlerator Standard vs ECO	0.9992	Near-perfect

Time-to-Compliance

Dryer	Standard	First	Consistent	Claimed	Gap
Dyson	≤0.1g (NSF)	80 sec	Never	12 sec	567%+
Xlerator Std	≤0.25g (UL)	50 sec	80 sec	8 sec	525–900%
Xlerator ECO	≤0.25g (UL)	70 sec	80 sec	8 sec	775–900%

Appendix 2: US Population Impact Evaluation

The Scale of the Gap

This appendix quantifies the consequences of the 70-80 second gap between manufacturer claims and actual drying requirements across the US installed base of commercial hand dryers.

Installed Base

- Estimated UL-certified hand dryers in US: ~1.5 million units
- Daily uses per dryer: ~100
- Total daily hand dryer uses: ~150 million
- Annual uses: ~54.75 billion

Extended Exposure Calculation

At manufacturer-specified times (8-12 seconds):

150 million daily uses × 10 seconds average = 1.5 billion person-seconds of exposure

At actual drying requirements (80 seconds):

150 million daily uses × 80 seconds = 12 billion person-seconds of exposure

Additional exposure: 10.5 billion person-seconds daily

Contamination During Extended Exposure

Our companion microbial study documents 49.6-fold amplification of bacterial and fungal contamination in dryer output air. During the gap between claimed and actual drying times:

Per-Use Contamination Exposure:

- Claimed exposure (12 sec): 12 seconds × 67 CFU/minute median = 13 CFU
- Actual exposure (80 sec): 80 seconds × 67 CFU/minute = 89 CFU
- **Additional CFU per use: 76 CFU**

Daily Population Exposure:

- 150 million uses × 76 additional CFU = 11.4 billion additional CFU daily
- Annual: 4.2 trillion additional CFU

Energy Consumption Gap

Claimed energy profile:

- 8-12 seconds at ~1,800W = 4-6 Wh per use
- Daily: 150M × 5 Wh = 750 MWh

Actual energy profile:

- 80 seconds at ~1,800W = 40 Wh per use

- Daily: 150M × 40 Wh = 6,000 MWh
- **Additional daily consumption: 5,250 MWh (7× claimed)**

Annual additional energy: 1.9 TWh—enough to power approximately 175,000 homes.

User Time Cost

- Gap per use: 70 seconds additional
- Daily aggregate: 150 million × 70 seconds = 10.5 billion seconds = 4.9 million hours
- **Annual: 1.8 billion hours of additional waiting time nationwide**

The Impossible Choice at Scale

At any given moment during business hours, approximately 125,000 people are using hand dryers in US public restrooms. Each faces the impossible choice:

- Leave with wet hands (facilitating 400-500× bacterial transfer)
- Continue for 70+ additional seconds of contamination exposure

Neither option delivers the hygienic outcome these devices are purchased to provide.

Summary

Metric	Manufacturer Claim	Actual Performance	Gap
Drying time	8-12 sec	80 sec	7-10×
CFU exposure per use	~13	~89	+76 CFU
Daily population CFU	2B	13.4B	+11.4B
Daily energy (MWh)	750	6,000	+5,250
Daily user time (hours)	417,000	3.3M	+2.9M

The gap between manufacturer claims and physical reality represents a systematic public health and economic burden affecting 150 million daily interactions with devices that cannot perform as advertised.

Data and statistical analysis code available for independent verification at www.handdryerstudy.com