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ABSTRACT
The Cosmetic Ingredient Review (CIR) Expert Panel (Panel) assessed the safety of 7 honey-derived ingredients. All of these ingredients are reported to function in cosmetics as skin-conditioning agents. The Panel considered the available data relating to the safety of these ingredients in cosmetic formulations. Because impurities, particularly pesticides and endotoxins, may be present in these ingredients, formulators should continue to use good manufacturing practices to monitor and limit these possible impurities. The Panel concluded the honey-derived ingredients are safe in cosmetics in the present practices of use and concentration described in this safety assessment.

INTRODUCTION
This is a safety assessment of the following 7 honey-derived ingredients as used in cosmetic formulations:

- Honey
- Honey Cocoates
- Honey Powder
- Honey Extract
- Hydrogenated Honey
- Hydrolyzed Honey
- Hydrolyzed Honey Protein

According to the web-based International Cosmetic Ingredient Dictionary and Handbook (wINCI; Dictionary), all of these ingredients function as skin-conditioning agents.1 Other functions include, but are not limited to, use as a flavoring agent, anti-acne agent, abrasive, binder, depilating agent, exfoliant, hair-conditioning agent, and nail-conditioning agent (Table 1). Use as an anti-acne agent is not considered a cosmetic function in the United States (US) and, therefore, does not fall under the purview of the Cosmetic Ingredient Review (CIR).

The Dictionary defines Honey Cocoates as a complex mixture of esters produced by the reaction of honey with coconut acid.1 In 2017, CIR published a safety assessment with the conclusion that coconut acid is safe in cosmetics in the present practices of use and concentration [as described in that safety assessment].2 In addition, the main components of Honey (i.e., fructose, glucose, maltose, and sucrose)3 were reviewed by CIR; in 2019, CIR published a safety assessment with the conclusion that these component ingredients are safe in the present practices of use and concentration [as described in that safety assessment].4

Some of the ingredients reviewed in this safety assessment may be consumed as food, and daily exposure from food would result in much larger systemic exposures than those from use in cosmetic products. Although oral studies are included herein, the primary focus of this safety assessment is on the potential for effects from topical exposure to these ingredients as used in cosmetics.

It should be noted that there are multiple species of bees that produce honey; however, honey used as a cosmetic ingredient, has been reported to be produced by the honeybee species Apis mellifera, Tetragonisca angustula, Scaptotrigona pectoralis, and Melipona Becheii.1 In several studies, the honey used for testing was not produced by these species, but produced by a different honeybee species (e.g., Apis dorsata). Data from these studies have been included in the report as these may be helpful in drawing a conclusion of safety for this ingredient group; however, the relevance of these data have yet to be determined. In most cases, information regarding the type of honey being tested (i.e., method of manufacture, floral source, species of producing bee), was not specified. However, if this information was available, it has been included in the report.

This safety assessment includes relevant published and unpublished data for each endpoint that is evaluated. Published data are identified by conducting an exhaustive search of the world’s literature. A list of the typical search engines and websites used, sources explored, and endpoints that CIR evaluates, is available on the CIR website (https://www.cir-safety.org/supplementaldoc/preliminary-search-engines-and-websites; https://www.cir-safety.org/supplementaldoc/cir-report-format-outline).

CHEMISTRY
Definition
All ingredients reviewed in this report are derived from honey, a natural sugar containing material produced from the processing of nectar and exudation of plants by honeybees.5 The definitions of the ingredients included in this report are provided in Table 1.1

Physical and Chemical Properties
Honey may be fluid, viscous, or solid, and ranges in color from clear to dark amber or black.6 Honey is acidic by nature; however, the pH and acidity levels vary depending upon botanical origin and geographic origin of the honey.5 The usual pH of honey ranges from 2 - 6. According to a manufacturer, a typical product with Honey Extract, prepared in water, is light to medium yellow in color, has a pH level of approximately 2.5 - 6.5 at 25°C, and is soluble in any proportion of water.7

Natural Occurrence
Honey is commercialized in most countries of the world.8 In the US alone, there are more than 300 types of honey, each with a unique flavor and color depending on the nectar source. Although there are many varieties of honey, the most common
types of commercialized honey include those from botanical sources such as acacia, alfalfa, avocado, blueberry, buckwheat, clover, eucalyptus, fireweed, manuka, orange blossom, sage, tupelo, and wildflower.

**Honeybee Species**

*Apis mellifera*, also known as the Western honey bee, is the most common honeybee species worldwide.9 This species was historically present across sub-Saharan Africa, Europe, parts of Western Asia, and the Middle East, and has now migrated westward to many countries, including the US. Honeybees of the *Tetragonisca angustula* species are stingless honeybees that are widely distributed in the neotropics, from Mexico to Northern Argentina.10 The *Scaptotrigona pectoralis* and *Melipona becheii* species are both stingless honeybee species found in South America.11,12

**Honey Production and Extraction**

To produce honey, forager bees collect sugar-rich nectar from plant sources.13,14 Once brought back to the hive, the nectar is distributed, ingested, and regurgitated multiple times. This process involves the physiochemical transformations of nectar, during which sucrose is inverted into dextrose and fructose by enzymes originating from the hypopharyngeal glands of the bees. The regurgitation process also aids in the process of dehydration of the solution. The altered nectar solution is then spread over an empty comb. Further dehydration occurs by the draft created by the flapping of bee wings in the hive. Once approximately 80% of the water content is evaporated, the honeycomb cells are capped with wax for preservation.

Traditionally, honey is collected by first introducing smoke into the beehive to sedate or remove bees.14 The combs are then removed and squeezed to drain honey. Honey can also be extracted by placing combs in a metallic bowl containing a drainage hole. Burning embers are placed on top of the comb, and melted honey is drained and collected. In order to mechanically extract honey, caps are removed from combs, and placed in an extractor where centrifugation is performed. The honey is then sieved and collected.

**Method of Manufacture**

Information on the manufacture of Honey Extract and of a tradename mixture containing Honey Extract was provided by suppliers. The methods below regarding Honey Powder and honey protein are general to the processing of these ingredients, and it is unknown if they apply to cosmetic ingredient manufacture.

**Honey Extract**

According to one supplier, to produce Honey Extract, the honey is first extracted with a specified eluent under appropriate temperature conditions to yield a concentrate.7 Typical eluents include water, butylene glycol, glycerin, and propylene glycol. The concentrate containing the phytochemical constituents is then blended with the desired diluent and preservation system to produce the final ingredient.

The manufacturing process of a tradename mixture containing 10.6% Honey Extract, 82.9% water, 4.4% propylene glycol dicaprylate/dicaprate, 1.5% phenoxyethanol, 0.3% xanthan gum, and 0.3% potassium sorbate was reported.15 A mixture of demineralized water, propylene glycol dicaprylate/dicaprate, and honey is combined with xanthan gum to create the final product. The manufacturing process of a different tradename mixture containing 16.5% Honey, 27.6% water, and 55.9% propylene glycol was also reported. Honey is extracted by a mixture of propylene glycol and water.16 The resulting product is then filtrated.

**Honey Powder**

A honey powder, for food use, is produced by the combination of honey, an emulsifier, an anti-caking agent, and filler materials of high molecular weight that increase the glass transition temperature.17 Filler materials include starch, carboxymethyl cellulose, gum Arabic, maltodextrin, and gelatin. The mixture is then powdered by using a either a spray or vacuum drying method with a filler to honey ratio of 50:50.

**Honey protein**

Honey proteins can be extracted via physical and chemical methods.18 When physically extracting proteins, honey undergoes ultrafiltration and ultracentrifugation to isolate amylase before purification by ion exchange chromatography. A dialysis method can also be used to remove low molecular weight and interfering compounds by passive diffusion through a semipermeable membrane. Another physical extraction method involves the absorption of honey proteins by beads with specific properties. Combinatorial hexapeptide ligand library and C18 beads are used to capture honey peptidome from honey samples of chestnut, sunflower, eucalyptus, orange, and acacia. The honey peptidome is then filtered and eluted from the beads using a solvent system. Microwave-assisted hydrolysis is another method used to extract proteins from honey. Chemical methods to extract honey involve co-precipitation using compatible precipitants, such as a sodium tungstate solution, trichloroacetic acid, sulfosalicylic acid, or ammonium sulfate.
Composition

**Honey**

Honey is a mixture of carbohydrates, proteins, enzymes, amino acids, vitamins, minerals, antioxidants, and other compounds. Enzymes in honey include invertase, glucose oxidase, catalase, and acid phosphorylase. The sugar composition of honey is dependent upon the content of saccharides in the nectar used to produce the honey. Generally, fructose and glucose are found in honey in similar amounts, with D-fructose as the prevalent sugar. Non-saccharide honey components include proteins, free amino acids (including proline), carboxylic acids (gluconic, citric, lactic, malic, succinic, butyric, propionic), essential oils, dyes, and vitamins. An overview of a chemical composition of honey can be found in Table 2.

Twenty-six amino acids have been reported in honey samples. Proline is the most predominant amino acid in floral honey, followed by phenylalanine and glutamic acid. Amino acids account for approximately 0.3 – 1% of total honey by weight. Phenolic acids and flavonoids are also present in honey. The most common phenolic acids found in honey are 4-dimethylaminobenzoic acid, caffeic acid, p-coumaric acid, gallic acid, syringic acid, and chlorogenic acid. Common flavonoids in honey include apigenin, genistein, pinocembrin, tricetin, chrysin, luteolin, quercetin, kaemferol, galangin, pinobanksin, and myricetin. The amounts of polyphenols in different honeys were quantified via high-performance liquid chromatography with diode-array detection (HPLC-DAD; Table 3). Generally, the quantity of a given polyphenol in the honey was approximately 0.2 mg/100 g honey, except for chestnut honey, which contained approximately 3 mg p-coumaric acid/100 g honey.

Depending on the floral source, plant toxins may be transferred to the honey that is produced from their nectar, including secondary metabolites such as pyrrolizidine alkaloids, grayanotoxins, hyoscyamine, hyoscine, saponin, strychnine, gelsemine, tutin, hyenanchin, oleandrin, and oleandrigenin. Honey collected from plants of the Ericaceae family (Andromeda sp., Rhododendron ponticum, Kalmia sp., Lleucothoe sp., Lynoia sp., Pieris sp.) has been shown to contain some of these toxins. Honey collected in areas where opium poppy cultivation is widespread has been reported to have narcotic effects.

Allergens, such as pollen, may also be present in honey. Ten grams of honey contains approximately 20 to 100,000 grains of pollen, which retain their allergenic properties during the honey-making process. Other allergens include secretions of pharyngeal and salivary glands of honeybee heads, and honey bee venom.

Several studies included in this report involve the use of tualang honey, which is a Malaysian multi-floral jungle honey produced by Apis dorsata. A comparison of the physiochemical characteristics of tualang and manuka honey (a honey formed by Apis mellifera) is provided in Table 4.

**Honey Extract**

The phenolic content of acacia, chestnut, orange tree, and woodland honey extracts were evaluated by HPLC. All honey extract samples had similar, but quantitatively different, phenolic profiles. The woodland honey extract was richer in polyphenols compared to the other three extracts, showing high levels of caffeic acid, coumaric acid, ferulic acid, iso-ferulic acid, pinobanksin, and pinocembrin.

**Impurities**

Environmental contaminants of honey include heavy metals (e.g., lead, cadmium, and mercury), radioactive isotopes, organic pollutants, polychlorinated biphenyls, pesticides (insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, and bactericides), pathogenic bacteria, and genetically modified organisms. Beekeeping contaminants include acaricides (i.e., lipophilic synthetic compounds and nontoxic substances such as organic acids and components of essential oils), antibiotics (e.g., tetracyclines, streptomycin, sulfonamides, and chloramphenicol), and paradichlorobenzene.

A compound that is not naturally present in honey, 5-hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF), may be formed during the heating (via the Maillard reaction) or preservation (e.g., via acid-catalyzed dehydration of hexoses) of honey. HMF is a compound that may be mutagenic, carcinogenic, and cytotoxic. The Codex Alimentarius has established that the HMF concentration in honey should be lower than 80 mg/kg; however, the European Union recommends a lower limit of 40 mg/kg.

According to one supplier, heavy metal testing was conducted on Honey Extract in a glycerin and water base. No antimony, arsenic, cadmium, chromium, iron, lead, mercury, or nickel was detected. In addition, no residual pesticides were detected.
**USE**

**Cosmetic**

The safety of the cosmetic ingredients addressed in this assessment is evaluated based on data received from the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the cosmetics industry on the expected use of these ingredients in cosmetics. Use frequencies of individual ingredients in cosmetics are collected from manufacturers and reported by cosmetic product category in the FDA Voluntary Cosmetic Registration Program (VCRP) database. Use concentration data are submitted by the cosmetic industry in response to a survey, conducted by the Personal Care Products Council (Council), of maximum reported use concentrations by product category.

According to 2019 VCRP survey data, Honey is reported to be used in 1002 formulations (638 of which are leave-on formulations), and Honey Extract is reported to be used in 359 formulations (172 of which are leave-on formulations; Table 5). All other in-use ingredients are reported to be used in 6 formulations or less. The results of a 2018 concentration of use survey conducted by the Council indicate Honey also has the highest concentration of use; it is used at up to 22% in paste masks and mud packs (which are considered rinse-off formulations). The highest concentration of use reported for leave-on products was in formulations containing Honey Extract at up to 7% in body and hand products. Use concentration data were reported for Honey Cocoates in response to the Council survey (it is used at up to 2% in rinse-off formulations), but no uses were reported in the VCRP; it should be presumed there is at least one use in a skin cleansing formulation, for which the concentration is reported. Conversely, VCRP data are available for Honey Powder, but concentration of use data were not reported. The ingredients not in use according to the VCRP and industry survey are Hydrolyzed Honey and Hydrolyzed Honey Protein.

Honey is reported to be used in baby products, products that would be used near the eye, and products that could result in incidental ingestion and mucous membrane exposure. Honey is reported to be used in 13 baby products and at up to 0.01%. It is also reported to be used in 20 lipstick formulations (up to 3%), dentifrices (up to 0.00035%; number of formulations unknown), and 4 “other” oral hygiene product formulations (up to 0.1%). Honey Extract could result in mucous membrane exposure as it is reported to be used in 14 products diluted for bath use (concentration unknown).

Additionally, Honey and Honey Extract are used in cosmetic sprays and could possibly be inhaled; for example, Honey is reported to be used in colognes and toilet waters and in hair sprays at up to 0.25% and 0.1%, respectively. In practice, 95% to 99% of the droplets/particles released from cosmetic sprays have aerodynamic equivalent diameters > 10 µm, with propellant sprays yielding a greater fraction of droplets/particles < 10 µm compared with pump sprays. Therefore, most droplets/particles incidentally inhaled from cosmetic sprays would be deposited in the nasopharyngeal and thoracic regions of the respiratory tract and would not be respirable (i.e., they would not enter the lungs) to any appreciable amount. Honey is reportedly used in face powders at concentrations up to 3%, and could possibly be inhaled. Conservative estimates of inhalation exposures to respirable particles during the use of loose powder cosmetic products are 400-fold to 1000-fold less than protective regulatory and guidance limits for inert airborne respirable particles in the air.

The honey-derived ingredients in this report are not restricted from use in any way under the rules governing cosmetic products in the European Union.

**Non-Cosmetic**

**Food**

Raw honey has been consumed worldwide for centuries. Honey is commonly used as a sweetener and flavoring agent in many foods. Honey is listed in the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Inert Finder Database as approved for food and non-food use pesticide products. For food use, it is regulated under 40 CFR 180.950a. In addition, the FDA requires proper labeling of honey and honey products to ensure that these products are not adulterated and misbranded. All honey and honey products must be labeled in accordance with sections 402 and 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 USC 342 and 343). The international FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Standard requires that:

- Honey sold as such shall not have added to it any food ingredient, including food additives, nor shall any other additions be made other than honey. Honey shall not have any objectionable matter, flavor, aroma, or taint absorbed from foreign matter during its processing and storage. The honey shall not have begun to ferment or effervesce. No pollen or constituent particular to honey may be removed except where this is unavoidable in the remove of foreign inorganic or organic matter. Honey shall not be heated or processed to such an extent that its essential composition is changed and/or quality is impaired.

Although rare, infant botulism has been reported after ingestion of honey due to *Clostridium botulinum* spores. Because of this, the FDA, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the American Academy of Pediatrics, recommend not feeding honey to infants younger than 12 months. According to a study, neither *Clostridium botulinum* spores nor the neurotoxins are able to penetrate the skin, however, damaged skin may be affected.
Honey can be found as an ingredient in over-the-counter (OTC) cough and cold medications. Traditionally, honey has been used as an antibacterial, antiseptic, anti-inflammatory, and apitherapeutic agent. Honey is commonly used for treatment of cuts, eczema, dermatitis, skin diseases, Fournier’s gangrene, burns, ulcers, surgical wounds, fungating wounds, pressure sores, and cancer or broken skin. Traditional, Ayurvedic treatments utilize honey for cardiac pain, palpitations, and eye ailments. Currently, there is an FDA-approved dermal dressing containing manuka or Leptospermum honey, used for the management of wounds and burns. Examples of wounds that are treated with this dressing are diabetic foot ulcers, leg ulcers, pressure ulcers, partial thickness burns, and surgical wounds.

TOXICOKINETIC STUDIES
Toxicokinetic studies were not available regarding these honey derived-ingredients. However, toxicokinetic information on some of the relevant, primary components of honey (fructose, glucose, and maltose) can be found in the CIR report on monosaccharides and disaccharides.

TOXICOLOGICAL STUDIES
No general toxicological studies were found in the published literature, and unpublished data were not submitted.

DEVELOPMENTAL AND REPRODUCTIVE TOXICITY STUDIES
The effect of Palestinian honey on spermatogenesis was studied in male albino rats (12 rats/group) after 20 days of treatment. Group A was given a 5% solution of Palestinian honey in drinking water, group B was treated with 5% sucrose in drinking water, and group C served as the control group and was given untreated drinking water. No significant effects on total body weight or weights of the testis, seminal vesicles, spleen, kidneys, liver, heart, or brain were noted. Rats treated with Palestinian honey displayed a significant increase in epididymal sperm count by 37% (P ≤ 0.05). The activity of testicular marker enzymes for spermatogenesis such as sorbitol dehydrogenase was increased by 31%, and lactate dehydrogenase was reduced by 48%, indicating an induction of spermatogenesis.

A study was performed in order to examine the effect of honey on the reproductive system of rat male offspring. Dams were divided into 10 rats/group. The control group received no treatment while treated animals were given honey (0.2 g/kg bw), daily, from day 1 of pregnancy to day 10, via gavage. In male offspring, testosterone levels were significantly lower in the treated group compared to the control group. Sperm counts, follicle stimulating hormone levels, and testes/epididymis weights were similar in control and honey-treated groups. The percentage of abnormal sperm was significantly higher in animals treated with honey compared to the control group.

GENOTOXICITY STUDIES
No genotoxicity studies were found in the published literature, and unpublished data were not submitted.

Anti-Mutagenicity
The potential anti-mutagenic effect of various honeys (fireweed, tupelo, Hawaiian Christmas berry, clover, acacia, buckwheat, and soybean) on 3-amino-1,4-dimethyl-5H-pyrido[4,3-b]indole (Trp-p-1), was studied. Trp-p-1 is a commonly encountered food mutagen, and has been demonstrated to be mutagenic in bacteria and carcinogenic in animals. The anti-mutagenic effects of the honeys were assayed according to an Ames assay, with slight modification. All assays were performed in a in a final volume of 1 mL containing potassium phosphate buffer, Trp-p-1 (5 µL of 20 µg/mL in dimethyl sulfoxide), 4% S9 mix (500 µL), test strain Salmonella typhimurium TA98 (2 x 10^10 cells/mL), and different honey solutions. Acacia, fireweed, soy, and tupelo honeys demonstrated enhanced anti-mutagenicity above 1 mg/mL, with inhibition between 40.3 and 62.9%; concentrations above 20 mg/mL did not further enhance anti-mutagenic effects. Clover and Hawaiian Christmas berry honey were most effective at 20 mg/mL, with 64.8 and 59.6% inhibition, respectively. The greatest inhibitory effect of buckwheat honey was observed at 1 mg/mL (52.1%).

CARCINOGENICITY STUDIES
No carcinogenicity studies were found in the published literature, and unpublished data were not submitted.

In Vitro
Renal cell carcinoma cells (ACHN) were cultured in a medium containing 10% fetal bovine serum and 5, 10, or 15% honey for 3 consecutive days. Cell viability was determined by the 3-(4,5-dimethyliazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide (MTT) assay, and apoptotic cells were determined using annexin V-fluorescein isothiocyanate (FITC) by flow cytometry. Honey decreased cell viability and induced apoptosis in malignant cells in a concentration- and time-dependent manner (P < 0.001). The half maximal inhibitory concentration (IC_{50}) values at 48 and 72 hours were 1.7 ± 0.04 and 2.1 ± 0.03 µg/mL, respectively.
A similar study was performed on human breast cancer (MCF-7, MDA-MB-231), immortalized cervical cancer (HeLa), and normal breast epithelial cells.\textsuperscript{51} Cells were plated at a concentration of 1 x 10\textsuperscript{5} cells/well. The cells were allowed to adhere overnight, and the culture medium was replaced with fresh assay medium supplemented with 2% fetal bovine serum. Cells were then treated with different concentrations of tualang honey (1 - 10\%), and incubated for up to 72 hours. Tualang honey induced a statistically significant increase in cell death in MDA-MB-231, MCF-7, and HeLa cancer cell lines in a dose- and time-dependent manner. Treatment of the normal breast epithelial cell line did not show a clear cytotoxic effect, even after 72 hours of incubation. Flow cytometric analysis of cells stained with annexin V-FITC and propidium iodide showed that tualang honey significantly increased apoptosis in all cancer cell lines compared to untreated cells.

**Animal**

The potential anti-carcinogenic effect of tualang honey on breast cancer was studied in rats.\textsuperscript{52} Forty Sprague-Dawley rats were given 80 mg/kg 7,19-dimethylbenz[a]anthracene (DMBA) via gavage. Rats were then divided into four groups. Animals in group 1 were given only distilled water. Animals in groups 2, 3, and 4 were given 0.2, 1, and 2 g/kg bw/day tualang honey diluted in 0.5 mL water, respectively, via gavage, for 150 days. After treatment, animals were euthanized. Breast cancers in the honey-treated groups had smaller tumor size compared to controls. In addition, the number of cancers developed in honey-treated rats was significantly lower than control groups (P < 0.05). The majority of the cancers in the control groups were high grade, while cancers in honey-treated groups were of medium or low grade. These effects, however, were not dose-dependent.

**Anti-Tumorigenicity**

The anti-tumoral therapeutic effects of tualang honey and manuka honey was studied in rats (10/group).\textsuperscript{53} Thirty female Sprague-Dawley rats were given an 80 mg/kg injection of the carcinogen 1-methyl-1-nitrosourea (MNU); an additional 10 female rats were left untreated. Treatment with honey started when the first tumor reached 10 - 12 mm in size. Positive (tumor induction and no honey treatment) and negative controls (no tumor induction or honey treatment) were included. Treatment groups were fed either tualang or manuka honey (1 g/kg bw/day for 120 days). On the 120\textsuperscript{th} day of treatment, rats were euthanized. Rats in the positive control group had the highest median number of tumors compared to groups treated with either honey. Groups treated with honey showed a significant reduction in tumor size and weight compared to the positive control group. The percent reduction in the size of primary tumors was greater with tualang honey, as compared to manuka honey. Tumor masses in the positive control group were solid, large in size, and hard in consistency, exhibiting areas of necrosis and hemorrhage. Both honey-treated groups had tumors which were softer, paler, and smaller in size. Tumors in the positive control group were observed to have increased heterogeneous nuclei formation, which were hyperchromatic, vesicular, and highly pleomorphic, with moderate cytoplasm increased mitotic activity compared with the honey-treated groups, which had fatty tissue, small nuclei, and cystic spaces.

**OTHER RELEVANT STUDIES**

**Airway Inflammation Reduction**

New Zealand white rabbits (5/group) were dosed twice with an intraperitoneal injection of ovalbumin (OVA) and aluminum hydroxide on days 1 and 14.\textsuperscript{54} Tualang honey was then given via a nebulizer from days 23 to 25 at concentrations of either 25 or 50%, diluted in sterile phosphate buffer saline (5 mL for 20 minutes). After treatment with aerosolized honey, animals were either euthanized, or, further exposed to aerosolized OVA for 3 days starting from day 28 and euthanized on day 31. The effects of honey on the inflammatory cell response, airway inflammation, and goblet cell hyperplasia were assessed. Treatment with aerosolized honey reduced the number of airway inflammatory cells present in bronchoalveolar lavage fluid and inhibited goblet cell hyperplasia. In addition, treatment with aerosolized honey led to a significant decrease in the thickening of the epithelial and mucosal regions.

**Nasal Respiratory Mucosa**

A study was performed in New Zealand white rabbits (2/group) to evaluate the effect of manuka honey on nasal respiratory mucosa.\textsuperscript{55} The left nasal cavity of each rabbit was irrigated once daily with 1.5 mL of a 33% mixture of manuka honey with saline; groups were treated for either 3, 7, or 14 consecutive days, and then euthanized. The last group was treated for 14 days followed by a 14-day washout period, and then euthanized the following morning. The right nasal cavity of each rabbits served as a control, and was not treated. The mucosa were examined by light microscopy. No histological evidence of inflammation, mucosal injury, or significant morphological changes were observed.

**Allergic Potential Following Ingestion**

Twenty subjects were used in a 12-week study to determine the allergic potential of manuka and multi-floral honey.\textsuperscript{56} The participants ate a normal diet with the inclusion of the allocated honey. For the first 2 weeks, all honey was excluded from the diet; then, participants consumed 20 g honey per day in two doses of 10 g each. After 4 weeks, there was another 2-week “washout” period, and the groups swapped to the other type of honey for 4 weeks. Fasting blood samples were collected at the beginning of the study, starting with the first sample after the initial 2-week washout, and then weekly during the 4-week interventions with honey. Immunoglobulin E (IgE) measurements were carried out on frozen serum collected weekly during
each of the honey interventions. IgE levels remained at a level consistent with a non-atopic response during the course of the study. The authors concluded that this level of consumption of manuka and multi-floral honey had no significant effect on allergic status.

**Cytotoxicity of Honey-Impregnated Wound Dressing**

The potential cytotoxic effect of honey-impregnated wound dressings on human skin keratinocytes and dermal fibroblasts was studied.\(^5\) Five and 21 days after initiating the tissue culture, the honey-impregnated wound dressing was introduced directly onto the cells in the test wells to allow for cell growth. Small blocks of commercial dressings were then inserted into the wells, adjacent and distal to the tissue explants. The amount of test material used was not stated. Keratinocytes and fibroblasts treated with honey implants displayed a modest uniform increase in early cell proliferation and cell counts per mm. Nuclear and cytocavitary networks appeared normal, and cell proliferation was also evident immediately adjacent to the product. No cell toxicity was observed.

**DERMAL IRRITATION AND SENSITIZATION STUDIES**

**Human**

*Honey Extract*

A human repeated insult patch test (HRIPT) was performed on 112 subjects using a test substance containing 7% Honey Extract.\(^5\) Approximately 0.2 mL of the test substance was applied to the upper back, under an occlusive patch. Patches were allowed to remain in direct skin contact for a period of 24 hours. Applications were made to the same site, three times a week, for a total number of 9 applications during the induction period. After a 2-week rest period, challenge patches were applied to previously untreated test sites. After 24 hours, patches were removed and test sites were evaluated. The test substance did not demonstrate a potential for eliciting dermal irritation or sensitization.

According to a summary report, an HRIPT was performed on 116 subjects using a product containing 0.01% Honey Extract according to the same procedure as above.\(^5\) The product was tested at a 1% dilution in water (effective test concentration, 0.0001% Honey Extract). Seven individuals displayed low-level reactions (mild erythema) during the induction phase, and one individual displayed a high-level reaction in the induction phase. Eight individuals displayed low-level reactions during the challenge phase. (Individual subject scores were not provided.) The test substance was considered by the researchers to be non-sensitizing.

**OCULAR IRRITATION STUDIES**

**Human**

*Use Study*

A prospective, randomized, paired-eye, investigator-masked trial was performed on 25 subjects to determine the clinical safety of manuka honey eye cream on patients with blepharitis.\(^6\) The cream (approximately 0.034 g ± 0.001 g) was placed on the periocular surface of the closed upper and lower eyelids of the affected eye. Applications occurred once a day, at night, for 2 weeks. The untreated eye served as a control. A questionnaire was given to grade the severity of dry eye symptomatology at baseline, and a telephone interview was conducted following the first day of cream application to check for immediate tolerability issues or adverse events. Clinical assessments were performed at baseline, day 7, and day 14 of the treatment period. There were no statistically significant differences in baseline clinical or impression cytology measurements between treated and control eyes. Twenty-three of 25 participants did not report any tolerability issues or adverse effects following the first day of product application. In two individuals, application too close to the eyelash margin and the use of excessive cream was presumed to result in a transient stinging sensation. Irrigation with water and reapplication of a modest quantity of cream resolved the issue in both cases. No other adverse effects were reported throughout the study.

**CLINICAL STUDIES**

**Effect on Damaged Pediatric Skin**

Eight pediatric patients ranging from 8 months to 13 years of age were evaluated in this study.\(^6\) Five of the children had second-degree burns, and three had necrotic ulcers, circular skin lesions, and deep cervical trauma. Each child was treated with povidone iodine (10% solution), fusidic acid, and systemic antibiotics, followed by a honey-based ointment. After this initial treatment, patients were instructed to apply honey-containing ointment as well as a dressing impregnated with a polymer containing 20% medical grade honey, daily. The duration and amount of product used in this study were not stated. No adverse effects or allergic reactions were observed.
Case Studies

Anaphylaxis
A 40-year old woman was referred to a clinic after suspected allergy to honey. At the age of 36, she had two episodes of generalized urticaria 20 minutes after ingestion of foods with honey. At the age of 37, five minutes after an inadvertent contact with a teaspoon with traces of honey, the patient reported swollen lips, urticaria, and angioedema. After treatment with oral corticosteroids and antihistamines, symptoms were resolved. Skin prick tests with standard panel of extracts from aeroallergens and common allergenic foods yielded negative results. Prick-to-prick tests (PPT) were performed with the previously consumed honey, and eight other kinds of honey (eucalyptus, sunflower, orange-tree, Arbutus-tree, French lavender, heather, flower incense, and rosemary). Results were positive for all honey types. Thirty minutes after the administration of the PPT, the patients suffered from anaphylaxis, generalized urticaria, swollen lips, tongue, and uvula, and hypotension. The same PPT was performed with these honeys in 6 control volunteers (3 healthy individuals, and 3 atopic with pollen sensitization and rhinitis). None of the volunteers displayed a positive skin reaction.

Epicutaneous Sensitization
A 48-year-old woman had been washing her body and hair with products blended with edible honey, and she applied honey to the face as a face pack. After 8 years of use, the woman developed itching and redness on facial skin as well as conjunctival hyperemia following the use of the face pack containing honey. After washing her body with honey-containing soap, the subject reported urticarial symptoms on her extremities and un-exposed face. One year later, the subject developed abdominal pain and distention after eating yogurt with honey. The patient had positive results for honey-antigen specific IgE antibodies in serum (UA), equivalent to 1.44 UA/mL, but not for honey bee venom or Api m 10 (Apis mellifera venom component). Results for specific IgE against three cross-reactive carbohydrate determinant marker allergens were negative. Prick tests with honey gave positive results. Fifteen minutes after oral challenge with 30 mL of honey, the patient developed eyelid swelling, abdominal pain, and oral tingling.

SUMMARY
The 7 honey-derived ingredients in this report all are reported to function in cosmetics as skin-conditioning agents. Other reported cosmetic functions include flavoring agent, abrasive, binder, depilating agent, exfoliant, hair-conditioning agent, and nail-conditioning agent. Honey derived for cosmetic purposes is reported to be produced by the honeybee species Apis mellifera, Tetragonisca angustula, Scaptotrigona pectoralis, and Melipona becheii.

Of the ingredients included in this report, Honey has the most reported uses, with a total of 1002; 638 of these are leave-on products. Honey Extract has the second greatest number of overall uses, with a total of 359 (172 are in leave-on formulations). Honey has the highest concentration of use, and is used at up to 22% in paste and mud packs. The highest concentration of use reported for leave-on products was in body and hand products containing Honey Extract at up to 7%.

The ingredients not in use according to VCRP data and the industry survey are Hydrolyzed Honey and Hydrolyzed Honey Concentrate. The ingredients included in this report are commonly used in leave-on products. Honey and Hydrolyzed Honey are used in leave-on cosmetics at 22% and 4%, respectively.

Traditional medicine suggests the use of honey for various ailments and skin issues. Currently, there is an FDA-approved dermal dressing containing honey used for the management of wounds and burns.

The effect of Palestinian honey on spermatogenesis was studied in male albino rats. Rats treated with Palestinian honey displayed a significant increase in epididymal sperm count. The activity of testicular marker enzymes for spermatogenesis, such as sorbitol dehydrogenase, was increased, and lactate dehydrogenase was reduced, indicating an induction of spermatogenesis. The effect of honey on the reproductive system of rat male offspring was studied. Testosterone levels were significantly lower in treated animals compared to control animals. The percentage of abnormal sperms were significantly higher in treated animals versus the control group. All other parameters were similar between treated and control group.

The potential anti-mutagenic effect of various honeys on Trp-p-1 was studied. Acacia, fireweed, soy, and tupelo honeys demonstrated enhanced antimutagenicity above 1 mg/mL, with inhibition between 40.3 and 62.9%. Concentrations above 20 mg/mL demonstrated no enhancement of the antimutagenic effects. Clover and Hawaiian Christmas berry honey were most effective at 20 mg/mL, with 64.8 and 59.6% inhibition, respectively. The greatest inhibitory effect of buckwheat honey was observed at 1 mg/mL (52.1%).

The anti-carcinogenic potential of honey (up to 15%) was studied using renal cell carcinoma cell lines. Honey decreased cell viability and induced apoptosis in malignant cells in a concentration- and time-dependent manner. A similar study was performed using tualang honey (1 - 10%) on human breast cancer, cervical cancer, and normal breast epithelial cell lines. Treatment with honey induced cell death in all cancer cell lines, but no clear cytotoxic effect was observed in the normal breast epithelial cells. In a different study, the effect of tualang honey (0.2 – 2 g/kg) on breast cancer-induced rats was observed. Smaller tumors were observed in honey-treated rats compared to control animals. In addition, the number of cancers developed in honey-treated rats was significantly lower than control groups.
In an anti-tumorigenicity study, Sprague-Dawley rats were given an injection of the carcinogen MNU and either given no treatment or treatment with manuka or tualang honey (1 g/kg bw/day) via diet. Groups treated with honey showed a significant reduction in tumor size and weight compared to the nontreated positive control. In addition, tumors in the positive control were large and hard, while tumors in honey-treated groups were small and soft.

In New Zealand white rabbits, treatment with aerosolized honey reduced the number of airway inflammatory cells present in bronchioalveolar lavage fluid and inhibited goblet cell hyperplasia. In addition, treatment with aerosolized honey led to a significant decrease in the thickening of the epithelial and mucosal regions. The nasal cavities of New Zealand white rabbits were irrigated with a honey and saline solution. No histological evidence of inflammation, epithelial injury, or significant morphological changes were observed.

Twenty subjects were used in a study to determine the allergic potential of manuka and multi-floral honey following ingestion. IgE levels remained at a level consistent with a non-atopic response during the course of the study.

The potential cytotoxic effect of honey-impregnated wound dressings on human skin keratinocytes and dermal fibroblasts was studied. Keratinocytes and fibroblasts treated with honey implants displayed a modest uniform increase in early cell proliferation and cell counts per mm. No cytotoxic effects were observed.

An HRIPT that was performed on 112 subjects using a test substance containing 7% Honey Extract applied using occlusive conditions yielded negative results. In an HRIPT performed on 116 subjects using a test substance containing 0.01% Honey Extract, tested as a 1% dilution, the test substance was considered to be non-sensitizing.

Twenty-five subjects were used in a 2-week prospective study to determine the safety of manuka honey eye cream on blepharitis patients. Twenty-three of 25 participants did not report any tolerability issues or adverse effects following the first day of product application. In two individuals, application too close to the eyelash margin and the use of excessive cream was presumed to result in a transient stinging sensation.

Honey-based ointment was used as part of a treatment of damaged skin in 8 children. No adverse effects or allergic reactions were reported after treatment.

Generalized urticaria was reported in a patient 20 minutes after ingesting foods with honey. After inadvertent contact with traces of honey, the same patient reported other allergic symptoms. Skin prick tests on common allergenic foods yielded negative results, however, prick-to-prick testing using different honey types yielded positive results.

After using cosmetics blended with edible honey and using honey as a face pack for 8 years, a woman reported allergic reactions after using a face pack containing honey and body soap containing honey. A year after these symptoms occurred, the patient experienced abdominal pain after ingestion of honey. Prick tests with honey yielded positive results.

**DISCUSSION**

The Panel reviewed the available data and concluded that these honey-derived ingredients are safe as used in cosmetics in the present practices of use and concentration. The Panel noted the lack of sensitization data for six of the seven ingredients, but determined that the available sensitization data on Honey Extract could be used to support the safety of the remaining ingredients. The safety of these ingredients is further supported by historical food use and use in wound dressings.

As Honey Powder has been reported to be 50% filler material, the Panel also discussed the safety of the possible filler ingredients (starch, carboxymethyl cellulose, gum Arabic, maltodextrin, and gelatin), and determined that these ingredients are not of concern. All of the named fillers have been previously reviewed by the Panel, and were considered safe as used in cosmetics.

The Expert Panel expressed concern regarding pesticide residues and endotoxins that may be present in these ingredients. They stressed that the cosmetics industry should continue to use current good manufacturing practices (cGMPs) to limit these impurities. In addition, the Panel noted the importance of avoiding the use of honey derived from toxic plant sources for use in cosmetic formulations.

The Panel discussed the issue of incidental inhalation exposure from formulations that may be aerosolized (e.g., colognes and toilet waters at up to 0.25% Honey). The Panel noted that in aerosol products, 95% – 99% of droplets/particles would not be respirable to any appreciable amount. Furthermore, droplets/particles deposited in the nasopharyngeal or bronchial regions of the respiratory tract present no toxicological concerns based on the chemical and biological properties of these ingredients. Coupled with the small actual exposure in the breathing zone and the concentrations at which the ingredients are used, the available information indicates that incidental inhalation would not be a significant route of exposure that might lead to local respiratory or systemic effects. A detailed discussion and summary of the Panel’s approach to evaluating incidental inhalation exposures to ingredients in cosmetic products is available at [https://www.cir-safety.org/cir-findings](https://www.cir-safety.org/cir-findings).
The CIR Expert Panel concluded that the following honey-derived ingredients are safe in cosmetics in the present practices of use and concentrations described in the safety assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honey</th>
<th>Honey Extract</th>
<th>Hydrolyzed Honey Protein*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honey Cocoates</td>
<td>Hydrogenated Honey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Powder</td>
<td>Hydrolyzed Honey*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not reported to be in current use. Were ingredients in this group not in current use to be used in the future, the expectation is that they would be used in product categories and at concentrations comparable to others in this group.
### Table 1. INCI names, definitions, and functions of the honey ingredients in this safety assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredient</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honey</td>
<td>Honey is a saccharic secretion gathered and stored by honey bees of the species, Apis mellifera, Tetragonisca angustula, Scaptotrigona pectoralis, or Melipona becheii</td>
<td>flavoring agent; humectant; skin-conditioning agent-humectant; solvent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Cocoates</td>
<td>Honey Cocoates is a complex mixture of esters produced by the reaction of honey with coconut acid. The fatty acid composition of coconut oil (from which coconut acid (CAS: 61788-47-4) is derived) is 0-1% caproic, 5-9% caprylic, 6-10% capric, 44-52% lauric, 13-19% myristic, 8-11% palmitic, 0-1% palmitoleic, 1-3% stearic, 5-8% oleic, 0-2.5% linoleic</td>
<td>antiacne agent; film former; skin-conditioning agent – miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Extract</td>
<td>Honey Extract is the extract of Honey</td>
<td>skin-conditioning agents-humectant; skin-conditioning agents-miscellaneous; solvents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Powder</td>
<td>Honey Powder is the powder obtained from dehydrated, ground honey</td>
<td>abrasives; binders; bulking agents; depilating agents; epilating agent; exfoliant; flavoring agent; hair conditioning agent; nail conditioning agent; skin-conditioning agent-miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogenated Honey</td>
<td>Hydrogenation Honey is the end product of controlled hydrogenation of honey</td>
<td>humectants; skin-conditioning agents-humectant; skin-conditioning agents-miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrolyzed Honey</td>
<td>Hydrolyzed Honey is the hydrolysate of honey derived by acid, enzyme or other method of hydrolysis</td>
<td>skin-conditioning agents-humectant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrolyzed Honey Protein</td>
<td>Hydrolyzed Honey Protein is the hydrolysate of honey protein derived by acid, enzyme or other method of hydrolysis</td>
<td>hair conditioning agents; skin-conditioning agents-miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Chemical Composition of Honey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>g per 100 g honey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carbohydrates</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fructose</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glucose</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maltose</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sucrose</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proteins, amino acids, vitamins, and minerals</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calcium</td>
<td>0.0044 - 0.0092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potassium</td>
<td>0.0132 - 0.0168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper</td>
<td>0.000003 - 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron</td>
<td>0.000006 - 0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnesium</td>
<td>0.0012 - 0.0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manganese</td>
<td>0.00002 - 0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phosphorous</td>
<td>0.0019 - 0.0063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sodium</td>
<td>0 - 0.00676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zinc</td>
<td>0.00003 - 0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascorbic acid</td>
<td>0.002 - 0.0024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thiamin</td>
<td>&lt; 0.000006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riboflavin</td>
<td>&lt; 0.00006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niacin</td>
<td>&lt; 0.00036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pantothenic acid</td>
<td>&lt; 0.00011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pyridoxine (B6)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.00032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Honey polyphenols quantified with the HPLC-DAD method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honey</th>
<th>Polyphenol</th>
<th>Mean amount (mg per 100 g honey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>p-coumaric acid</td>
<td>0.077 ± 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chestnut</td>
<td>p-coumaric acid</td>
<td>2.952 ± 0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eucalyptus</td>
<td>quercetin</td>
<td>0.164 ± 0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunflower</td>
<td>caffeic acid</td>
<td>0.242 ± 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunflower</td>
<td>p-coumaric acid</td>
<td>0.107 ± 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunflower</td>
<td>kaempferol</td>
<td>0.205 ± 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunflower</td>
<td>chrysir</td>
<td>0.217 ± 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thyme</td>
<td>p-coumaric acid</td>
<td>0.070 ± 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wild carrot</td>
<td>p-coumaric acid</td>
<td>0.223 ± 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>tualang honey</td>
<td>manuka honey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>Dark Brown</td>
<td>Light to Dark Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>3.55 – 4</td>
<td>3.2 – 4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture Content</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reducing Sugars</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fructose</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glucose</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sucrose</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maltose</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potassium</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calcium</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnesium</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sodium</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.0008%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carbon</td>
<td>41.58%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oxygen</td>
<td>57.67%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- = Not Reported

Table 4. Physicochemical properties and constituents of tualang vs. manuka honey

Table 5. Frequency and concentration of use of honey ingredients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Uses</th>
<th>Max Conc of Use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honey</td>
<td>Honey Cocoates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals*</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave-On</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinse-Off</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diluted for (Bath) Use</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Area</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental Ingestion</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental Inhalation-Spray</td>
<td>2; 177; 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental Inhalation-Powder</td>
<td>177; 7a; 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermal Contact</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair - Non-Coloring</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair-Coloring</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucous Membrane</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Products</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Exposure Type |
| Honey Powder |
| Totals* | 6 | NR |
| Duration of Use |
| Leave-On | 3 | NR |
| Rinse Off | 3 | NR |
| Diluted for (Bath) Use | NR | NR |

*Because each ingredient may be used in cosmetics with multiple exposure types, the sum of all exposure types may not equal the sum of total uses.

a Not specified whether a spray or a powder, but it is possible the use can be as a spray or a powder, therefore the information is captured in both categories

b It is possible these products are sprays, but it is not specified whether the reported uses are sprays.

c It is possible these products are powders, but it is not specified whether the reported uses are powders

NR – no reported use
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