CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #:	2012
DateRun:	08/13/2012
Experimenters:	Junhee Cho, Johnny Le
ClientType:	Cleaner Manufacturer
ProjectNumber:	Project #1
Substrates:	Skin
PartType:	Coupon
Contaminants:	Dirt
Cleaning Methods:	Manual Wipe
Analytical Methods:	Visual
Purpose:	To investigate the supplied product cleaning efficacy for hand washing against a nationally recognized conventional product
Experimental Procedure:	Before the test, each tester's skin condition was characterized as moist, normal, dry or very dry. After checking the skin condition, quarter size amount of mixed soil paste (synthetic carpet soil with water) was applied to one hand. Then, tester rubbed hands together to distribute soil to both hands for 10 seconds. One pump of hand soap (supplied and conventional product) was applied for each test. Each tester rubbed hands together with soap and water for 20 seconds and rinsed both hands in tap water for 20 seconds. After all, both hands were wiped with paper towel and were dried for 20 seconds. Finally, at least two testers determined the cleaning efficacy for each test based on standard. Observe cleanliness Rank Cleanliness 1 No signs of soil 2 Only in fine lines of hand or Intermittent spots but not in fine lines 3 Intermittent spots and in fine lines 4 Multiple spots 5 Continually covered Observe lathering/rinsing Rank Lathering/Rinsing 1 Lots of lathering – easy rinsing 2 Some lathering – easy rinsing 3 Some lathering – hard rinsing 4 Little lathering – easy rinsing/ No lathering – easy rinsing 5 No lathering – hard rinsing Observe skin condition after clean/rinse/dry at 1 minute, 5 minutes, 20 minutes and 60 minutes. Rank Skin Condition Observation 1 Smooth and soft 2 Some dryness 3 Dry - Hands turning white 4 Skin stiffening 5 Very dry - Cracking of skin
Results:	Two hand washing cleaners (common good hand soap, cleaner hand soap) were tested. Six participated testers tested both cleaners based on same test protocol and condition. In this test, Common good hand soap showed better observed cleanliness than comparison product. However, common good hand soap was harder to make a lathering than comparison product. Two products showed similar level of rinsing and skin condition after used. Detail information is below. GS 41 Performance testing (hand cleaner and had soaps used)

Cleaner	Cleanliness	Lathering	Skin condition				
	(1-5)	(1-5)	(1-5)	1 min	5 min	20 min	60 min
Common Good Hand soap							
	1	2	4	1	2	2	2
	2	3	4	1	1	1	2
	3	2	4	1	1	3	3
	4	4	4	1	1	1	1
	5	3	4	2	1	1	1
	6	3	4	2	1	2	2
AVG	2.8	4	1.5				
	1	4	2	1	1	2	2

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

Target Brand	2	5	3	2	2	2	1
	3	4	2	1	2	2	2
	4	4	2	1	2	2	2
	5	2	4	2	2	2	2
	6	5	4	2	2	2	2
AVG	4	2.8	1.6				

Summary:

Substrates:	Skin
Contaminants:	Dirt

Company Name:	Product Name:	Conc.:	Efficiency:	Effective:	Observations:
Common Good & Co	Hand Soap Option #1	100	0.00	☑	2.8 cleanliness; 4 lathering; 1.5 skin condition
Target Brands, Inc.	Up and Up Clear Hand Soap	100	0.00	☑	4 cleanliness; 2.8 lathering; 1.6 skin condition

Conclusion: This test showed that supplied hand washing cleaner (common good hand soap) has better performance to remove a soil against the comparison conventional product.