

## TECHNICAL BULLETIN

### GOJO<sup>®</sup> Mild Foam Hand Wash Fragrance Free

#### Technical Data

INDICATIONS: For general institutional handwashing.

DIRECTIONS: Wet hands. Apply 2 pumps of product and thoroughly cover hands with lather. Rinse well and dry hands completely.

#### Physical Properties

Appearance: **Clear, Colorless Liquid**

Fragrance: **Fragrance Free**

Form: **Liquid**

pH: **4.8 – 7.5**

#### Ingredients

INCI Name*	Ingredient Class
<b>Aqua</b>	Carrier
<b>Sodium Laureth Sulfate</b>	Surfactant, Foam Booster
<b>Cocamidopropyl Betaine</b>	Surfactant, Foam Booster
<b>Disodium Cocoamphodiacetate</b>	Surfactant, Cleansing Agent, Foam Booster
<b>PEG-80 Sorbitan Laurate</b>	Surfactant, Cleansing Agent, Solubilizing Agent
<b>Propylene Glycol</b>	Skin Conditioning Agent, Humectant
<b>Citric Acid</b>	pH Adjuster
<b>Polyquaternium-10</b>	Conditioning Agent
<b>Methylchloroisothiazolinone</b>	Preservative
<b>Methylisothiazolinone</b>	Preservative

\*International Nomenclature Cosmetic Ingredient

## Irritancy Data and Allergy Test Results

### 21 Day Cumulative Irritancy Assay with Delayed Challenge

<b>Objective:</b>	Evaluation of skin irritation potential in humans.
<b>Description of Test:</b>	21 Day Cumulative Irritancy Assay with Challenge. Fresh materials are applied daily, 6 days per week, for 21 days to the same site (patches were not moved or reapplied on Sunday).
<b>Independent Laboratory:</b>	RCTS, Inc., Irving, TX
<b>Date:</b>	20 November 2004
<b>Results:</b>	Average Score = 0.21 (scale 0 – 4); No sensitization occurred.
<b>Conclusions:</b>	Mild – no experimental irritation.

### Human Repeated Insult Patch Test

<b>Objective:</b>	Determination of the dermal irritation and sensitization potential of the product.
<b>Description of Test:</b>	Human repeated insult patch test.
<b>Independent Laboratory:</b>	Clinical Research Laboratories, Inc., Piscataway, N.J.
<b>Date:</b>	19 November 2004
<b>Results:</b>	No visible skin reactions were observed during the induction or challenge phases of the study.
<b>Conclusions:</b>	Test product did not demonstrate a potential for eliciting either dermal irritation or sensitization.

## Environmental Testing

### Biodegradation

<b>Objective:</b>	To determine the potential for biodegradation of test products in mineral salts medium by the carbon dioxide evolution method following OECD Test Guideline 301B.
<b>Description of Test:</b>	OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) 301B CO <sub>2</sub> Evolution Test.
<b>Independent Laboratory:</b>	Springborn Smithers Laboratories, LLC, Wareham, MA
<b>Date:</b>	7 June 2006
<b>Results:</b>	For the test product, mean CO <sub>2</sub> production was 74.5% at day 28 and greater than 60% CO <sub>2</sub> production occurred within a 10-day window of reaching 10% CO <sub>2</sub> production.
<b>Conclusions:</b>	The test product can be considered “readily biodegradable” under the OECD criterion.

### Toxicity

<b>Objective:</b>	To determine the aquatic toxicity of test product using Luminescent Bacteria ( <i>Photobacterium phosphoreum</i> )
<b>Description of Test:</b>	Toxicity Test Using Luminescent Bacteria ( <i>Photobacterium phosphoreum</i> ), Environment Canada Report EPS 1/RM/24, 1992.
<b>Independent Laboratory:</b>	Bodycote Essais de Matériaux Canada Inc., Québec, Canada
<b>Date:</b>	24 April 2006
<b>Results:</b>	IC <sub>50</sub> > 1000mg/L
<b>Conclusions:</b>	Not toxic to aquatic life per test method Toxicity Test Using Luminescent Bacteria ( <i>Photobacterium phosphoreum</i> ), Environment Canada Report EPS 1/RM/24, 1992.

This product meets Green Seal and EcoLogo<sup>M</sup> environmental standard for institutional hand cleaners based on its reduced human and aquatic toxicity and reduced smog production potential.