AN FTIR-BASED EXPLORATION OF THE EFFECTS OF WET CLEANING TREATMENTS ON ARTISTS’ ACRYLIC EMULSION PAINT FILMS
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Understanding changes to acrylic emulsion paint films during wet surface cleaning treatments is a priority for conservators of modern painted surfaces. To explore the presence, extraction and removal of soluble components from acrylic paint films, contemporary paint samples and works of art were examined using several FTIR-based techniques including: transmission microscopy, attenuated total reflectance (ATR) and in-situ non-invasive mid-IR reflectance spectroscopy. The major constituents identified on paint surfaces and extracted from bulk films were non-ionic polyethoxylate (PEO) type surfactants used as dispersing agents and emulsion stabilisers. The identification of other extracted constituents was hampered by low concentrations and the proprietary nature of many additives. Surface surfactant was removed within five to twenty seconds by aqueous swabbing treatment, by accelerated light ageing, and was relatively unaffected by aliphatic solvents. Monitoring of contemporary paint films after aqueous cleaning treatment confirms that surfactant continues to migrate to the surface. The analysis of contemporary paint films suggests surface surfactant abundance is primarily influenced by brand. Combined results from the in-situ analysis of five paintings dating between 1962 and 1973 confirmed the presence of surfactant on some paint layers and not others.

1 Introduction

Research into acrylic emulsion artists’ paints has confirmed that non-ionic polyethoxylate-type (PEO) surfactants exude to the surface of acrylic emulsion paint films as small rounded crystals and/or coherent thin films.¹⁻³ These surfactants, such as the Triton series, were invented in the 1930s and have been used as wetting agents and stabilisers in emulsion formulations since the early 1960s.⁴ These materials remain the most IR-detectable compounds both on the surface and within aqueous extracts of acrylic emulsion paints. The presence of Triton X-405 (a non-ionic octylphenol ethoxylate surfactant) has
been confirmed in conjunction with other aqueous extractable materials such as preservatives via liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry\textsuperscript{5} and other mass spectrometry techniques.\textsuperscript{6-8} Triton X-405 and X-305 have also been identified via electrospray ionisation mass spectrometry in extracts from cotton swabs wetted with deionised water and rolled over the surface of several acrylic emulsion paintings.\textsuperscript{9}

The presence of surfactants on the surface of acrylic emulsion paint films is of interest to conservators for several reasons: surfactant is original material to these paints; surface accumulation causes changes in gloss and surface unevenness; surfactant layers contribute to the retention of surface dirt through mechanical and hygroscopic interactions; PEO-type surfactants have proven to be readily water-soluble; and research into the short- and long-term consequences of surfactant removal on underlying paint layers is ongoing. Despite the growing body of evidence demonstrating that changes to the physical and optical properties of acrylic emulsion paints induced by aqueous conservation treatments are minimal or perhaps even beneficial,\textsuperscript{1,3,10-12} the presence of surface surfactant may also be associated with other cleaning process issues such as paint swelling, pigment removal and water-sensitivity.\textsuperscript{13}

The migration of surfactant(s) to the surface of acrylic emulsion paint films is acknowledged by artists’ paint manufacturers. For example Golden Artist Colours have explored the presence as well as the effect of surfactant migration and removal on several of their paint films.\textsuperscript{12,14} The migration of surfactants in unpigmented acrylic polymer dispersion films has also been well documented in the latex polymer field.\textsuperscript{15,16} One response to prevent surfactant migration is to incorporate the use of chemically bonded or cross-linked surfactants that are therefore (at least theoretically) unable to migrate to the surface; however, these materials have thus far not been adopted by the artists’ paint industry due to their prohibitive cost.\textsuperscript{12}

The occurrence and behaviour of surface surfactant on acrylic emulsion paint films has been explored as part of ongoing collaborative research at Tate, London. A series of contemporary acrylic emulsion artists’ paint films were prepared in 2003 and have been subsequently monitored using infrared-based techniques after natural ageing; exposure to accelerate ageing, and simulated cleaning and solvent extraction treatments. While the investigation of contemporary paint films is essential to explore the conservation and preservation issues surrounding these paints, the surfaces of works of art also need to be examined - and particularly as paint formulations have been (and continue to be) subject to frequent change. For this, a group of five paintings in Tate’s collection dating from 1962-1973 were monitored for the presence and subsequent removal of surface surfactant during wet-cleaning treatments, including surface analysis via in-situ non-invasive reflectance spectroscopy made available through transnational access MOLAB.
2.1.3 Paintings

Five acrylic emulsion paintings on canvas were examined as case studies for the Tate AXA Art Modern Paints Project (TAAMPP) including: Jeremy Moon’s Untitled 2/72 (1972) and Hoop-la (1965), Andy Warhol’s Portrait of Brooke Hayward (1973), Alexander Liberman’s Andromeda (1962); one of the earliest acrylic paintings in Tate’s collection and John Hoyland’s 24.5.69 (1969). With the exception of the Warhol painting - where the priming and silkscreen ink areas were identified as oil modified alkyd media - all paints were identified as p(EA/MMA) copolymers, as listed in Table 1. Between them, the following pigments were identified: titanium white; cadmium red and yellow; cobalt blue; Mars red and black; umber; chromium oxide and the extenders calcium carbonate, calcium sulphate and barium sulphate. In addition, several synthetic organic pigments were identified via FTIR microscopy and/or Direct Exposure-Mass Spectrometry (DEMS) as: PV19, PV23, PB16, PR3, PR122, PR181, PR207, PY3, and PV23.

2.2 Sample Preparation

2.2.1 Solid paint extracts

Samples of the same size and shape were removed from the contemporary paint films and subjected to 24 h, 20 µL deionised water extractions in glass vials. The extracts were then pipetted onto clean cavity slides to dry in dark, dust free conditions. Representative scrapings from each sample were analysed via transmission μ-FTIR spectroscopy.

2.2.2 Paint surface extracts

Aqueous surface extracts of contemporary paint films and paintings were prepared by pipetting 40-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist and Title</th>
<th>Paint sample description (colour)</th>
<th>Pigments identified</th>
<th>Extenders identified</th>
<th>Paint medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moon Hoopla</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Cadmium red</td>
<td>BaSO₄</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>PB16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon Untitled 2/72</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Cadmium orange</td>
<td>BaSO₄</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>PV19, Ti white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warhol Portrait of Brooke Hayward</td>
<td>Blue canvas</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Cobalt blue, Ti white</td>
<td>CaSO₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>PR122, Ti white</td>
<td>CaSO₄</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dark pink</td>
<td>PR207, Ti white</td>
<td>CaSO₄</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light pink</td>
<td>Organic red, Ti white</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silk screen</td>
<td>Carbon black, silica</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Alkyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aqua green</td>
<td>Unidentified green, Ti white</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow green</td>
<td>Cadmium yellow, chrome oxide, Ti white</td>
<td>CaSO₄</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>PR207, Ti white</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priming</td>
<td>Ti white</td>
<td>CaSO₄</td>
<td>Alkyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Cadmium yellow, Ti white</td>
<td>BaSO₄</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>PR122, Ti white</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Cadmium yellow, PR122, Ti white, Mars red</td>
<td>BaSO₄, Chalk</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silk screen</td>
<td>Carbon black, silica</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Alkyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priming</td>
<td>Ti white</td>
<td>CaSO₄</td>
<td>Alkyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberman Andromeda</td>
<td>Dark green</td>
<td>Chrome green and Mars black</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dark purple</td>
<td>PV23 + PR181</td>
<td>CaSO₄</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>PV23 + PR181</td>
<td>Ti white</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mars black</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyland 24.5.69</td>
<td>Umber</td>
<td>Burnt umber</td>
<td>BaSO₄, Chalk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe oxide red</td>
<td>Iron oxide</td>
<td>BaSO₄</td>
<td>EA/MMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid red</td>
<td>Cadmium red</td>
<td>BaSO₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid green</td>
<td>PY3, unidentified blue pigment</td>
<td>BaSO₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scarlet red</td>
<td>PR3 and Cadmium red</td>
<td>BaSO₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cadmium red</td>
<td>Cadmium red</td>
<td>BaSO₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Pigment and medium content of five case study acrylic emulsion paintings in Tate’s collection; via FTIR microscopy, EDX, PyGCMS and DEMS analysis.
60 μL deionised water directly onto paint surfaces and leaving the water to extract for one to 2 min. The extract was then transferred, dried and analysed as described above.

2.2.3 Cleaning simulation

Contemporary paint samples were subjected to up to 1 min swab rolling treatments with one or more of the following wet systems: deionised water; 0.5% v/v Triton X-100/XL-80N®; 1% w/v. triamminium citrate (TAC); 2% v/v ethanol solution; Stoddard solvent (18% aromatic content) or 60-80/80-100 BP mineral spirits. Those samples requiring clearance were also swab rolled with deionised water for 10 s.

2.2.4 In-situ analysis

The paintings Portrait of Brooke Hayward, Andromeda and 25.4.69 were examined using the in-situ mid-IR reflectance system (described later). Analysis areas were chosen to include a single paint and a Mylar template was used to guide the reflectance probe to the same location after cleaning. Cleaning sites were photographed and x-y locations noted. Each test area was exposed to a 15s cotton swab roll with deionised water and/or 80-100 BP mineral spirits. Cleaned surfaces were left to air dry and after treatment data collected. It was noted that in most cases the cleaned area was visible in raking light due to the removal of soiling and surface surfactant.

2.3 Instrumentation

2.3.1 μ-FTIR Spectroscopy

For transmission mode collection a Nicolet Avatar 360 spectrometer was used with a single diamond cell and a Thermo-Nicolet Spectra Tech IR plan microscope; spectra were collected over 128 scans at 4 cm−1 resolution, between 4000 and 600 cm−1.

2.3.2 Attenuated Total Reflectance (FTIR-ATR)

For ATR analysis, a Germanium ATR crystal attachment was used with the Nicolet Avatar 360 spectrometer and the number of scans increased to 200. All ATR results presented are semi-quantitative due to the repeatable pressure achievable with the ATR unit used. At ~2000 cm−1 the ATR system has a penetration depth of around 0.66 μm. All data was processed using Omnic 6.2 software.

2.3.4 Reflectance Mid-IR Spectroscopy

Reflectance mid-IR spectra were recorded in situ using a portable JASCO VIR 9500 spectrophotometer equipped with a Remspec mid-infrared fibre optic sampling probe. The probe was a bifurcated cable containing 19 chalcogenide glass fibres, 7 of which carried the IR radiation from the source to the sample, while the other 12 collected the radiation reflected from the surface. Interferograms were collected from 4000 to 900 cm−1 at a resolution of 4 cm−1 using a metal mirror plate reference. Three spectra were collected from each area. The probe was kept perpendicular to the sample surface (0°/0° geometry); the distance between probe and surface was fixed at about 5 mm. The investigated sample area width, determined by the probe diameter, was about 20 mm².

Spectral data are presented as pseudo absorbance A' [A'=log(1/Reflectance)] and were processed using JASCO software. The spectra in reflectance mode (at 0°/0° geometry) are strongly affected by specular and diffuse reflection, where distortion cannot be corrected by Kramers Kronig or Kubelka Munk corrections. In particular, the specular reflection is governed by Fresnel’s law and depends upon both the absorption index (k) and refractive index (n) and wavenumber. Reflectance spectra of minerals and some organic compounds can be distorted by the inversion of bands showing the k > n (reststrahlen effect), thus in reflection mode, those bands appear as negative signals. It has been demonstrated in another study that the intensity of the reststrahlen bands is proportional to the concentration of the analyte.17
PEO dry residues. The spectra for the standard materials illustrates how chemically similar they are, with commercial distinctions based primarily on molecular weight and occasional differences seen in the IR spectra such as the small band at 1511 cm\(^{-1}\) and the single band at 1343 cm\(^{-1}\). The characterisation of surface surfactant was duly affected by the extenders and pigments present in the paint films, potentially masking the 1511 cm\(^{-1}\) band present in the Triton X-405 spectrum. The single band at 1343 cm\(^{-1}\) on the Talens ATR spectrum (Figure 1a) does however suggest the presence of a polyethylene glycol-based material.

Figure 1b compares the ATR spectra taken from the air interface of four contemporary TiO\(_2\) paint films. Due to the semi-quantitative nature of this analysis, the spectrum for the Talens paint indicates that there is a high abundance of a PEO-based material on the surface by the main group of bands at \(\sim 1110\) cm\(^{-1}\) and the C-H stretching region at \(\sim 2890\) cm\(^{-1}\). Similarly, the spectra for the three remaining \(\text{pn} (\text{BA/MMA})\) based paints demonstrates that these films have relatively little surfactant on the surface, where the spectra are dominated by bulk-film constituents. For the remainder of this paper, surfactant will be referred to as PEO-based unless otherwise identified.

### 3.2 Monitoring Surfactant Migration - Contemporary Paint Films

Figure 2 summarises the surfactant migration trends for two TiO\(_2\) paints after natural, light and thermal ageing, as monitored with semi-quantitative ATR analysis. The relative abundances of surface surfactant are expressed as a ratio dividing the absorbance of the largest surfactant band at \(\sim 1110\) cm\(^{-1}\) with that of the corresponding carbonyl band at \(\sim 1730\) cm\(^{-1}\), contributed by the acrylic resin only. Higher surfactant abundance was consistently detected on the Talens paints \(\text{p}(\text{EA/MMA})\) than the three \(\text{pn} (\text{BA/MMA})\) based paints (as shown in Figure 1b) suggesting that abundance is primarily related to paint brand (or base-emulsion); although minor differences have been noted between different pigmented paints of the same brand.\(^1\), \(^3\) The trend lines also illustrate that the amount of surface surfactant increases over time when paint films are stored in dark conditions. However due to the scaling used, it is difficult to observe the slight increase in surfactant detected on the naturally aged Liquitex sample over the 4 year period.

Surfactant could not be detected on either paint type immediately after accelerated light ageing, presumably due to the enhanced photo-degradation of the surface surfactant. To date, only trace levels have been detected on light-aged samples after 4 years natural ageing in dark conditions.\(^3\) Observations from case-study painting surfaces
have confirmed that substantial amounts of surfactant can be present on paintings after 45 years or more natural ageing (see Figure 7), however many of the case study paintings had not been subject- ed to light exposure though display for prolonged periods. For both paint types, thermal ageing initially caused surface surfactant (melting point of ~45 °C) to melt and migrate back into the bulk film, however as illustrated, the migration rate post-ageing appears to have accelerated significantly due to increased polymer coalescence induced by the ageing regime and/or increased mobility resulting from thermal degradation of the surfac- tant within the bulk film.

3.3 Characterisation of Aqueous Extracted Material - Solid Sample Extracts of Contemporary Paint Films

Contemporary acrylic emulsion paint free-films were subjected to 24-h deionised water extrac- tions as described in Section 2 Experimental, to identify components potentially vulnerable to extraction through aqueous cleaning. A PEO-type compound was detected in the extracts of many of the paints tested (i.e. four brands and four pig- ments) and also in paints with no detectable sur- face surfactant; confirming that prolonged expo- sures to aqueous systems can result in extraction of surfactant from the bulk paint film. The PEO- based surfactant extracted from the Liquitex white paint shown in Figure 3 was tentatively identified as Triton X-405 by the presence of the small band at 1511 cm⁻¹ and the doublet at 1360 and 1342 cm⁻¹. The band at ~1730 cm⁻¹ probably originates from the paint medium (possibly residual acrylic acid) and the small, broad band at ~1570 cm⁻¹ may arise from residual water or from one of the many other paint additives used in these paints, such as the polycarboxylic acid-based pigment dispersant Tamol®.

3.4 Characterisation of Aqueous Extracted Material - Surface Extractions of Contemporary Paint Films and Paintings

To assess the presence of surfactant on the sur- face of paintings, short aqueous surface extrac- tions were performed as described in Section 2 Experimental. Although clearly not suitable for all paint surfaces, this technique successfully facil- itated the identification of surface surfactant and did not appear to extract material from the under- lying paint films. Table 2 lists the results of surface extractions from several contemporary paint films on canvas and the case-study paintings. In all cases the major component present in the surface extracts was a PEO-based surfactant and in some cases a Tamol type product was tentatively identi- fied. Extraction results correlate well with the corresponding ATR and portable IR spectroscopy data taken from the same paint films, for example, the Warhol painting was confirmed as having no surface surfactant present with all three IR tech- niques.

The data in Table 2 also suggests a possible link between the presence of surface surfactant and organic and iron-based pigmented films, which requires further exploration. This may be due to the relative difficulty of dispersing hydrophobic organic and iron-based pigments in acrylic dispersion media, necessitating the use of greater quan- tities of surfactant. As noted earlier, the presence of surface surfactant on the contemporary paint samples appears to be primarily brand dependent; hence it is also possible that the variations in sur- face surfactant abundance noted on the case- study paintings may result from the artists’ use of different paint brands.

3.5 Monitoring the Effects of Cleaning Treatments on Surface Surfactant - Contemporary Paint Films

An earlier ATR study by the authors documented the removal of surfactant by several aqueous- based cleaning systems and the non-removal of surfactant using non-polar aliphatic solvents. Figure 4 summarises the results of experiments designed to explore the time taken to remove surface surfactant from contemporary paint films via swab rolling with deionised water. As shown, all of the detectable surfactant was removed within 20 s,
and in some cases within 5-10 s depending on initial surfactant abundance. The small rise in the curve for the Talens titanium white sample between 0 and 5 s is most likely accounted for by a slight pooling or swelling of the surfactant during cleaning, as previously observed using Atomic Force Microscopy.1

### 3.6 Monitoring Surfactant Migration Post-cleaning - Contemporary Paint Films

The surfactant content of any paint film is finite (unless perhaps the film is replenished by cleaning with a surfactant-based solution); therefore, migration is expected to decrease over time. Some of the important questions surrounding the wet-cleaning of acrylic emulsion paint films are: whether one aqueous surface cleaning treatment is enough to clear paint films of surface surfactant permanently, whether surfactant continues to exude post-treatment, and/or whether the use of wet-cleaning methods affects the rate of subsequent migration.

To investigate this, TiO$_2$ and gesso samples were monitored for 4 years after one aqueous cleaning treatment where all detectable surfactant had been removed. The y-axes of the graphs in Figure 5 reflect the differences in amounts of surface surfactant initially present on each of the brands monitored. The control sample curves for all samples (i.e. no treatment) indicate that surface surfactant abundance has increased over time (also demon-
strated by Figure 2) although the increases noted for the Liquitex samples are relatively small.

Taking each brand in turn, the surfactant migration rates for the cleaned Liquitex TiO$_2$ samples do not appear to have been significantly affected by any of the cleaning systems when compared to the control. The cleaned Liquitex Gesso samples are also similar to the control except for the deionised water and Triton X-100® treatments, which appear to have slightly reduced the post-cleaning migration rate. The post-cleaning rates for the cleaned Talens samples initially varied from the control, however over the four-year period these differences appear reduced. Although this data is preliminary and subject to error from data averaging and the presence of uneven surfactant films, it nonetheless confirms that the surfactant migration process is ongoing after one aqueous cleaning treatment, and therefore contributes to ongoing cleaning debates by suggesting that one aqueous cleaning treatment will not necessarily ensure a surfactant free paint(ing) surface in the future.$^{19}$

3.7 In-situ Analysis - Contemporary Paint Films and Paintings

To assess the potential for portable mid-IR spectroscopy to detect the presence of PEO surfactants on the surfaces of paintings, the Talens titanium white control canvas film (high surfactant abundance) was analysed as a test case. Figure 6 shows a portion of the spectra containing the largest surfactant bands at around 1110 cm$^{-1}$, confirming that surfactant was detected on the surface. Due to the reflectance effect, the surfactant bands have an inverted form (reststrahlen effect) appearing as minima rather than maxima and each

---

Figure 5: Post-cleaning ATR monitoring of four acrylic emulsion free films (Liquitex and Talens gesso and TiO$_2$) over a period of 4 years dark ambient storage - all tests repeated 3 times and data averaged.

Figure 6: Reflectance mid-IR spectra from a Talens contemporary TiO$_2$ paint sample (black), a sample cleaned via 30 s swab rolling with deionised water (blue) and the reference spectrum of Triton X-405 (red).
minima are in good agreement with the maxima of the absorption bands of the surfactant spectrum acquired in transmission mode (red). The third spectrum (blue) clearly illustrates the removal of surfactant from the surface via a 30 s deionised water swabbing treatment through the disappearance of all inverted bands.

Three of the five case studies were also analysed with this system. Figure 7 shows a section of spectra from the painting 25.4.69 by John Hoyland, where the green (containing PY3) and brown (umber) paints have the highest surface surfactant abundance as indicated by the intensity of the band at circa 1110 cm⁻¹ (inverted mode).

Interestingly, these colours also exhibited the greatest water sensitivity during aqueous cleaning tests, which requires further exploration. The iron-based red paint has some surface surfactant, although less abundant than the brown and green paints. The cadmium-based bright red and orange paints had minimal or no surface surfactant, which was also noted for the cadmium-based passages on both Moon paintings. Documentation of the removal of surfactant from these paintings with aqueous and non-aqueous systems was also achieved using this system, and is published elsewhere. On the whole, the results from this system concur with the ATR and surface extract data listed in Table 2.

4 Conclusions

The use of several IR-based techniques has contributed significantly to a growing body of information on the effects of wet cleaning treatments on acrylic emulsion paint films, aiding conservators facing complex treatment decisions. For each of the techniques used (ATR, transmission μ-FTIR and portable reflectance mid-IR spectroscopy); the major materials identified on the surface and in aqueous extracts of acrylic emulsion paint films were PEO-type surfactants. However limitations caused by detection limits, interference from bulk paint film materials, residual water, similarities in the structures of PEO-based surfactants and the presence of other paint additives prevented their exact identification.

Nonetheless, these techniques proved particularly useful for documenting relative differences in surface surfactant abundance with respect to: paint brand; pigment type; response to accelerated ageing; changes induced by surface by cleaning treatments; differentiating between the effects of aqueous and aliphatic solvent systems; and tracking the migration of surfactant post-ageing and post-cleaning. The speed at which surfactant can be removed from these paint films was also tracked; proving in some cases that surfactant could no longer be detected after 5 s of aqueous swabbing. The portable reflectance IR system provided important information on the presence of PEO-type surfactants on painting surfaces, where it was noted that surfactant abundance may also be related to the presence of organic and iron-based pigments.

5 Appendix A

DEMS analysis conditions: analysis was carried out on a Varian 1200L MS detector with a Scientific Instrument Services Direct Exposure Probe. Sample was placed onto a rhenium (Re) filament and heated at 0.5 A/min for 3 min and 10 s with maximum amp value of 1.5. MS conditions: Source temp: 250 °C in EI mode (70 eV); scan range 50-1400 amu; scanned every 1 s for 3.5 min.

6 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the Leverhulme Trust and AXA Art Insurance for funding research at Tate; Dr. Mark Underhill, Dr. Joyce Townsend and Patricia Smithen of Tate for DEMS, EDX analysis and treatment case studies respectively. The in situ analytical work was carried out through the Eu-ARTECH, MOLAB Transnational Access service supported by the EC within the 6th Framework Programme (Contract Eu-ARTECH, RII3-CT-2004-506171). Kenza Kahrim, Antonino Cosentino and Alessia Daveri of MOLAB are also acknowledged for their in-situ experimental work.
7 References


18. Tate conservation records: Hoyland T01129, Moon T02052.