

HP LaserJet Cartridge Reliability Comparison Study – 2022

HP LaserJet Toner Cartridges vs. EMEA Imitation Brands

The *spencerLAB* DIGITAL COLOR LABORATORY has conducted a cartridge reliability comparison testing of original HP Inc. (HP) LaserJet toner cartridges and six imitation brands of toner cartridges sold in the EMEA region. The test included CF226A (26A) and CE285A (85A) cartridge models for the HP LASERJET PRO M402dne (26A) and HP LASERJET PRO P1102w (85A). For both cartridge models, ten cartridges of each brand were tested to get statistically significant overall results.

The analysis compared the Reliability and the overall Print Quality throughout the life of the toner cartridge models tested for each brand. Cartridge Reliability factors, such as Dead-on-Arrival (DOA), Premature Failure (PF) and Low Quality (LQ) cartridges [see definitions in Appendix 4], were evaluated to determine the total number of Problem Cartridges for each brand. Print samples from each cartridge brand were collected at equal intervals over the life of the cartridge, and sorted using a Print Quality Acceptance scale generated from a psychometric research study. The four PQ acceptance levels were – External Use (all uses including distribution outside the company), Internal Use (distribution inside company), Individual Use, and Unusable.


KEY FINDINGS

- Testing of the Original HP toner cartridges yielded no Problem Cartridges, whereas 58% of imitation cartridges exhibited some type of reliability problem, such as Dead-on-Arrival, Premature Failure or Low Quality.
- HP cartridges had the larger percentage of External Use Print Quality samples at 99.2%, whereas the tested imitation brands exhibited only 39.7% External Use Print Quality samples.
- Imitation brands tested exhibited more Print Quality Samples with defects, including fade (1%), dark prints (17%), ghosting (17%), and streaks (37%).

CARTRIDGE RELIABILITY: DEAD-ON ARRIVAL, PREMATURE FAILURES & LOW QUALITY

HP cartridges were more reliable than the tested imitation brands; none of the tested HP cartridges were deemed Problem Cartridges -- no Dead-on Arrival (DOA), no Premature Failures (PF) or Low Quality (LQ).


The imitation toner cartridges suffered from Reliability issues including DOA, PF and LQ, yielding a total of 58.3% Problem Cartridges of the 120 cartridges tested. Dead-on-Arrival cartridges accounted for 7.5% of the imitation cartridges. Low Quality cartridges (those with 50% or more pages categorized as Limited Use, but not DOA or PF) accounted for 38.3%, and



Premature Failure cartridges (those with page counts of less than 80% of the average page count for all HP toner cartridges of that model, but not DOA) accounted for 12.5% of the imitation cartridges. For the average user, problem cartridges are disruptive, causing inconvenience due to a lack of reliability, which impacts and increases the overall cost of printing.


PRINT QUALITY DISTRIBUTION

HP cartridges produced significantly greater number of pages with higher Print Quality (PQ) than the imitation cartridges tested. Tested HP cartridges produced a total of 99.2% of print samples categorized as good for External Use. Comparatively, the imitation brand cartridges produced only 39.7% of pages that were good for External Use.



HP cartridges produced only 0.8% Internal Use pages, with no pages deemed as Unusable or Individual;

whereas, imitation brands produced Limited Use pages (with PQ categorized as either Internal Use, Individual Use, or Unusable) accounting for 60.3%. Of the imitation brand Limited Use pages, 72% exhibited print quality defects such as fade, dark prints, ghosting, and streaks.



THE *spencerLAB* DIGITAL COLOR LABORATORY

With over thirty years of industry service, SPENCER & ASSOCIATES PUBLISHING, LTD. has earned a premier reputation for its expertise in evaluating digital color imaging and printing. Its independent test division, the *spencerLAB* DIGITAL COLOR LABORATORY, is internationally recognized as a leader in unbiased, third-party research and comparative analysis of digital imaging and printing system performance; the laboratory strictly adheres to the integrity of its methodology, even in commissioned studies. *SpencerLAB* provides leadership in quantitative and qualitative comparisons, benchmarking key performance metrics of digital printing systems in all technology classes, from desktop printers to digital color presses – providing research and evaluation services, compliance certifications, benchmark test software/hardware, and focus group management.

Leading vendors and firms for whom printing is mission-critical rely upon *spencerLAB* to provide strategic support and benchmarking of Print Quality, Ink/Toner Yield and Cost-per-Print, Throughput, Availability, Reliability and Usability for ink- and toner-based as well as other printing technologies. Corporate users rely upon *spencerLAB* for guidance in print system acquisition and usage optimization.


For more information, please visit www.spencerlab.com.

January 2022

© Spencer & Associates Publishing, Ltd.

May not be reproduced in whole or in part without explicit permission.

APPENDIX 1: PROBLEM CARTRIDGES



†Images magnified to show Print Quality defect.

Note: Images may not be accurately reproduced when printed from this report

APPENDIX 2: METHODOLOGY

TEST PARAMETERS

The test included 26A and 85A cartridge models tested on the HP LASERJET PRO M402dne and the HP LASERJET PRO P1102w, respectively. Imitation brands were selected by HP and procured for testing from North America by *spencerLAB*. For both cartridge SKUs, ten cartridges of each brand were tested to get statistically significant overall results.

A four-page PDF test suite was printed from a Windows 10 operating system, using Acrobat Reader 20.009.20067. Test files were printed in default mode for plain paper, using the latest printer drivers available from HP's website, on Hammermill Fore Multi-Purpose 20lb., 96 Brightness, office paper. All test printing was performed by *spencerLAB*.

Two HP test printers were assigned to each toner cartridge brand and model in order to avoid cross-contamination of brands and to minimize printer-to-printer performance variation. All test supplies, such as printers, toner cartridges, and paper, were acclimated to office ambient temperature and humidity for at least 12 hours. Printing was performed in a semi-continuous manner, with stops for paper replenishment, overnight, etc., until toner cartridges reached End-of-Life (EOL). EOL is defined as degradation of Print Quality of any one page of the four-page suite to Unusable (grading scale with Unusable Print Quality benchmark established by psychometric study [see Appendix 3]). Two shake procedures were performed prior to a cartridge being deemed EOL.

CARTRIDGE RELIABILITY TESTING

Prior to printing, all cartridges were carefully unpacked and inspected for any toner leakage and/or broken parts.

PRINT QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Overall Print Quality was evaluated on a total of sixty-four print samples from each toner cartridge. The sixty-four print samples comprised of sixteen four-page suites collected at equally dispersed intervals over the life of the cartridge.

Using the psychometric Print Quality acceptance scale, *spencerLAB* evaluators independently assessed and graded the overall Print Quality of the samples by categorizing them into one of four Print Quality levels: External Use, Internal Use, Individual Use, and Unusable. The Print Quality level of each print sample was determined by the average of the evaluators' grades, with defects also noted.

As a part of evaluator training, the Print Quality evaluators graded a set of twenty print samples, three times each. Consistency of grading was measured among the evaluators, as well as among each evaluators' grades for a sample. This exercise was repeated until all evaluators had acceptable consistency in grading among each other and among their three trials per sample. During evaluation of the test print samples, the Print Quality assessment by evaluators was continuously monitored to ensure consistency. Each evaluation session lasted one hour with a thirty minute break between sessions.

The Print Quality scale samples, determined during psychometric testing, were mounted in front of evaluators' workstations for reference. Print Quality evaluation was performed in a neutral environment with uniform lighting.

APPENDIX 3: PSYCHOMETRIC STUDY – PRINT QUALITY SCALE

A psychometric study of monochrome office printing users was conducted by *spencerLAB* in the greater New York City area (Hicksville, New York) in March of 2012, to establish a Print Quality acceptance scale. Participants who printed monochrome documents for personal, internal, and external use, were recruited from a range of professions and business sizes, from micro business (1-49 employees to enterprise business (>500 employees). A total of thirty-eight business printing users participated in the exercise.

TEST SUITE

SpencerLAB collaborated with HP to design a representative business-user test suite. *SpencerLAB* then utilized the test suite pages to simulate common Print Quality defects such as banding, streaks, dark and light density, ghosting, etc. A total of fifteen test sets were created and each test set had a range of up to twelve variations (based on severity of defect) for a single defect type.

Test sets were printed on a HP LaserJet P3015 using Windows 7 and Acrobat Reader 10.1.2. Test samples were printed in default mode for plain paper, using the latest print driver available from HP's web site at the time of printing on Hammermill Fore MP

20lb., 96 Brightness, plain office paper. All printing was performed by *spencerLAB* and test sets were reviewed to ensure that the test samples were rendered as intended.


BUSINESS USER FOCUS GROUPS

The focus group participants judged fifteen sets of print samples and sorted the samples into four Print Quality levels based on their acceptance level of Print Quality. The test samples were rated in a neutral environment, with no external lights, and uniform lighting.

Participants sorted all the test samples into four Print Quality acceptance levels:

- External Use – acceptable for all uses, including distribution outside a company to customers, vendors, etc.
- Internal Use – acceptable for distribution inside a company, but not acceptable for distribution outside a company
- Individual Use – usable as a copy to read, file, or mark-up in the office, but not acceptable for distribution, either within or outside a company
- Unusable – not acceptable for any business purpose

SpencerLAB used proprietary sorting and analysis algorithms to calculate the average Print Quality rating of each sample for each test set. The resulting score was used to determine the rank order of samples in each test set.



DARK DENSITY TEST SET SAMPLE

External Reference

Reference

External/Internal

K

Internal/Individual

L

Individual/Unusable

J

EXTERNAL REFERENCE EXTERNAL/INTERNAL INTERNAL/INDIVIDUAL INDIVIDUAL/UNUSABLE
BOUNDARY BOUNDARY BOUNDARY
 LOWER PQ - INTERNAL LOWER PQ - INDIVIDUAL LOWER PQ - UNUSABLE

LIGHT DENSITY TEST SET SAMPLE

External Reference

Reference

External/Internal

S

Internal/Individual

C

Individual/Unusable

J

EXTERNAL REFERENCE EXTERNAL/INTERNAL INTERNAL/INDIVIDUAL INDIVIDUAL/UNUSABLE
BOUNDARY BOUNDARY BOUNDARY
 LOWER PQ - INTERNAL LOWER PQ - INDIVIDUAL LOWER PQ - UNUSABLE

Examples above are the boundary samples from two of the fifteen test sets.

NOTE: IMAGES MAY NOT BE ACCURATELY REPRODUCED WHEN PRINTED FROM THIS REPORT.

APPENDIX 4: TEST TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

| Terms | | Definitions |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| End-of-Life, (EOL) | | A condition determined by one of three mechanisms: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cartridge is Dead on Arrival. 2. Cartridge stops printing and efforts to recover are unsuccessful. 3. Degradation of Print Quality to unacceptable (Unusable) for any one of the Test Suite pages. Any printer documentation recommendations are performed no more than two times to recover PQ. After the second recovery, if PQ does not recover or degrades to Unusable, EOL is reached and marked before pages of unacceptable quality. |
| Dead-on-Arrival, (DOA) | | A condition determined by one of four mechanisms: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A cartridge that has at least 50% of the handling surface covered in leaked toner, before or during the installation process and/or toner visibly spilled in the plastic bag containing the cartridge and/or on the exterior of the cartridge. 2. A cartridge that within the first ten pages has at least one page categorized as Individual Use or Unusable, and does not improve during the recovery process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recovery process requires following the printer manual instructions for correction of the noted defect, or if the defect is not addressed in the manual, the first attempt to recover shall be to remove the cartridge and perform a shake procedure. Following this recovery process, ten more pages shall be printed and evaluated. If at least one page is categorized as Individual Use or Unusable, a second recovery attempt of printing a cleaning page, if available, shall be performed. Following the second recovery procedure, ten more pages shall be printed and pages evaluated for categorization. If at least one page is categorized as Individual Use or Unusable following this recovery process, the cartridge is DOA. 3. Cartridge is broken or missing parts. 4. Cartridge fails to operate upon installation and does not recover upon removing the cartridge and re-installation. |
| Premature Failure, (PF) | | A cartridge with a page count of less than 80% of the average page count for all HP toner cartridges of that model that were not DOA, unless non-HP cartridge stated yield differs from HP stated yield. |
| Low Quality, (LQ) | | A cartridge with 50% or more pages categorized as Limited Use, but was not DOA or PF. |
| Problem Cartridges | | Cartridges categorized as either DOA, PF, or LQ. |
| Limited Use | | Sample pages with PQ categorized as either Internal Use, Individual Use, or Unusable. |
| Print Quality Levels | External Use | Acceptable for all uses, including distribution outside a company to customers, vendors, suppliers, etc. Examples: marketing materials to promote the company or products, official company correspondence, invoices. |
| | Internal Use | Acceptable for distribution inside a company, but not acceptable distribution outside a company. Examples: documents to distribute to colleagues, immediate superiors or subordinates as business communication. |
| | Individual Use | Usable as a copy to read, file, or mark-up in the office, but not acceptable for distribution, either within or outside a company. |
| | Unusable | Not acceptable for any business purpose. |
| Usable Pages | | Pages that were acceptable for any use, and not deemed Unusable. |
| Imitation Toner Cartridge | | A newly manufactured non-HP cartridge with a shell made from new plastic molds, uses aftermarket components, and then is filled with non-HP toner. |

*spencer***LAB**
RELIABILITY TESTED