

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

SCL #: 2012

DateRun: 08/14/2012

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 (1-5) | Lathering (1-5) | Skin condition (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 | | | | |
| Target Brand | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |

CLEANING LABORATORY EVALUATION SUMMARY

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|
| | 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 | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2.8 cleanliness; 4 lathering; 1.5 skin condition | | |
| Target Brands, Inc. | Up and Up Clear Hand Soap | 100 | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 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.