## Dermatological Test Report Semi Occlusive Patch Test

| Test Reference | $21 / 04685 / 001$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Customer | Wipertec Ltd |
| Contact | Andy Abraham (andy@wipertecltd.co.uk) |
| Address | Unit 33/Peel Ind Est/Chamberhall St, Bury BL9 OLU |


| Product Name | Mylux Skin Cleansing | Test Date | 20/08/2021 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Batch Code | N/A | Report Date | $29 / 09 / 2021$ |

## Scope of Tests Compliant With:

- Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council (EC) No. 1223/2009 of 30 November 2009 on cosmetic products.
- Cosmetics Europe - The Personal Care Association (previously COLIPA) Guidelines Product Test Guidelines for the Assessment of Human Skin Compatibility 1997.
- Cosmetics Europe - The Personal Care Association (previously COLIPA) Guidelines for the Evaluation of the Efficacy of Cosmetic Products 2008.
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## 1. The Basis of the Study

- Test sample delivered by the Client.
- The qualitative composition of the product delivered by the Client.
- The result of microbiology delivered by the Client.

The Client is responsible for compliance with the declared qualitative composition and microbiological purity of the product sample sent for testing.

## 2. Object of Study:

| Parameter | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| Appearance | Wet Wipe |
| Colour | White |
| Fragrance | Characteristic for raw materials (or fragrance composition) |
| Packaging | Replacement packaging containing the name and sample <br> number for testing |

## 3. Qualitative Composition of the Product

The qualitative composition was delivered to the Laboratory by the Client before the start of the study.

## 4. Purpose of the Study

The aim of the study was to assess the irritating properties (skin tolerance) of the cosmetic product on a healthy adult skin, with applied patch test.

## 5. Description of Volunteers

The volunteers ( 25 people) were healthy, with positive allergy history. The selection of the group included the criteria of inclusion and exclusion. General inclusion criteria: healthy men and women over 18 years old, phototype: I-IV on Fitzpatrick scale, Caucasians, skin without irritations and changes requiring pharmacological treatment. General exclusion criteria: volunteers who use any treatment on the skin area subject to the study, volunteers exhibiting or having a known history of acute or chronic dermatological, medical and/or physical conditions that could influence the outcome of the study, pregnant or breastfeeding women or women planning a pregnancy during the study. None of the volunteers reported documented oversensitivity or history of adverse reactions to individual ingredients of the product tested. All the volunteers fulfilled the requirements of inclusion for tests and signed the Informed Consent Form (ICF). Additionally, they were informed on the purpose, methodology of the study and possible adverse effects. The skin at the application spot (arms or interscapular area) was healthy, without lesions. The volunteers were advised to exercise caution in handling the applied contact tests..

## 6. Testing Methodology

The preparation in the appropriate concentration is applied onto filter paper discs of 12 mm diameter, manufactured by SmartPractice ${ }^{\circledR}$ and then fixed to the arm or interscapular area with the use of a sticking patch. Simultaneously, to objectify the results of the study and in order to exclude possible reading errors connected with dermal irritations two control samples (control sample called "blind" and control sample with water) are used.The purpose of this study is to exclude possible reading errors connected with dermal irritations. The results of the study are presented in section 10 of this report. The dermatologist removes the patch 48 h after the application and examines the skin response 30 minutes after removal. 72 h after the application, the dermatologist examines the skin again for a response. If irritations appear or persist 72 h after the application, an additional examination takes place after 96 hours. Determining the response of the skin, the dermatologist assesses the irritating and sensitising effects of the tested product. The study results may be influenced by factors such as lifestyle, stress, diet and environmental conditions, etc.

## 7. Date of Performance of the Study

17.08.2021-20.08.2021

## 8. Evaluation Parameters

## Evaluation Parameters of Skin Reaction Erythema

## No Erythema

## Light Erythema

Classification point
0
0.5

Erythema and/or papules 1
Erythema and/or papules and/or vesicles 2
Erythema and/or papules and/or vesicles and/or blisters 3
Erythema Bullous and/or ulcerative reaction and/or papules and/or vesicles and/or blisters

## Edema

No Edema
Classification point

Very light Edema (hardy visible)
Light Edema


Moderate Edema (about 1 mm raised skin) 3

Strong Edema (extended swelling even beyond the application area)

## 9. Results

In 25 volunteers with a positive history of allergy the results of the patch tests were negative, i.e. no irritation or allergy related with the preparation were observed. Results are presented in table no. 2.

Table 1

| No. of subject | Identificatio n of subject | Beginning of the study | Age | Sex | Phototype |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | KAL.GR | 17.08.2021 | 63 | F | II |
| 2 | SIK.GR | 17.08.2021 | 66 | F | II |
| 3 | GRA.AL | 17.08.2021 | 45 | F | II |
| 4 | GRA.MA | 17.08.2021 | 69 | F | II |
| 5 | SZY.UR | 17.08.2021 | 35 | F | II |
| 6 | MAR.AN | 17.08.2021 | 50 | F | II |
| 7 | WOJ.SE | 17.08.2021 | 66 | F | II |
| 8 | SZR.MA | 17.08.2021 | 45 | F | II |
| 9 | DUD.IR | 17.08.2021 | 64 | F | II |
| 10 | BER.AN | 17.08.2021 | 50 | F | II |
| 11 | SOS.AG | 17.08.2021 | 32 | F | II |
| 12 | DAS.EW | 17.08.2021 | 68 | F | II |
| 13 | SEK.EL | 17.08.2021 | 68 | F | II |
| 14 | BRZ.SY | 17.08.2021 | 23 | F | II |
| 15 | CZA.HA | 17.08.2021 | 66 | F | II |
| 16 | WYS.BE | 17.08.2021 | 33 | F | II |
| 17 | LIS.DA | 17.08.2021 | 35 | F | II |
| 18 | MAC.EL | 17.08.2021 | 49 | F | II |
| 19 | OGI.AL | 17.08.2021 | 55 | F | II |
| 20 | KRO.AL | 17.08.2021 | 55 | F | II |
| 21 | PIO.EL | 17.08.2021 | 51 | F | II |
| 22 | JAS.KA | 17.08.2021 | 45 | F | II |
| 23 | TAR.AG | 17.08.2021 | 57 | F | II |
| 24 | OKU.AG | 17.08.2021 | 49 | F | II |
| 25 | ROZ.AG | 17.08.2021 | 39 | F | II |
|  |  | Min | 23 | No. F | Phototype I |
|  |  | Max | 69 | 25 | 0 |
|  |  | Average | 51 | No. M | Phototype II |
|  |  |  |  | 0 | 25 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Phototype III |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Phototype IV |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0 |

### 9.2 Table of skin response

Table 2

| No. | Evaluation after 48 hours of product application |  | Evaluation after 72 hours of product application |  | Evaluation after 96 hours of product application |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Erythema | Edema | Erythema | Erythema | Edema | Erythema $\quad$ Edema |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |
| 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Examination skipped |

## 10. Calculated Values

The following calculated values present the sum of negative reaction (erythema and edema) defined as Average Irritation Index (Xav).

Table 3

|  | Evaluation after 48 hours <br> of product application |  | Evaluation after 72 hours <br> of product application |  | Evaluation after 96 hours <br> of product application |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Erythema | Edema | Erythema | Edema | Erythema | Edema |
| The sum of <br> negative <br> reaction <br> (the sume <br> of <br> of <br> classificatio <br> n points) | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Xav |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | Examination skipped |  |

## 11. Interpretation

The average irritation index ( $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{av}}$ ) of the 25 tests was calculated. The product was then classified according to the following table:

Table 4

| Average Irritation Index (xav) | Class |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{av}}<0.50$ | Not Irritating |
| $0.50 \leq \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{av}}<2.00$ | Slightly Irritating |
| $2.00 \leq \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{av}}<5.00$ | Moderately Irritating |
| $5.00 \leq \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{av}}$ | Highly Irritating |

## 12. Conclusion

The patch test study was performed under dermatological control on a group of 25 volunteers with positive history of allergy/atopy (sensitive skin). The study allows to conclude that product 21/04685/001 - Mylux Skin Cleansing used by volunteers, that didn't report documented oversensitivity or a history of adverse reactions to individual ingredients of the tested product, is well tolerated by the skin. In the tested group of volunteers there were no irritations or allergic reactions. The product meets the requirements of compatibility test with the skin (Skin Compatibility Test) and can be classified as NOT IRRITATING.
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