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Problem definition

• Hydroperoxides (HP) of widely used terpenes (Limonene and Linalool) are skin sensitizers

• Positive patch test reactions to oxidized terpene fractions, containing these HP’s, are frequently reported

• Hydroperoxides in these oxidized fractions presumed to be specific allergens

• **Limited evidence on occurrence of hydroperoxides in consumer products**

• Exposure source for induction of HP contact allergy is currently unknown

• What type of products?

• Status of products? Aged? Oxidized?
Problem definition: Analytical methods

• Analytical detection of HP is challenging

• HP are not intentionally added to products, but
  – They could be introduced as impurities from raw materials
  – They may form in products if sufficient oxygen is present or as a consequence of age

• There are very little exact data on HP levels in raw materials

• There are even less data on HP level in consumer products

• Analytical data are needed to establish whether positive patch test reactions may come from use of fragranced consumer products

• Analytical methods able to detect HP in consumer products are required
There are two different questions:

- **Quality control on raw materials**: Detection of HP in raw materials used in fragrance compounding
  - Complex essential oils from natural sources (e.g. lavender oil)
  - Synthetic raw materials (e.g. synthetic linalool)
- **Detection in final consumer products**
  - Detection in general market products and aged consumer samples
    ⇒ Presence of potentially **sensitizing doses** above levels considered safe by QRA?
  - Detection in products brought in by patch-test positive patients
    ⇒ Presence of potentially **elicitating doses** which may indicate relevance of reaction to actual disease?
Sensitivity: 
Targets set for the task force

• **Initial analytical target agreed:**
  “Methods should be sensitive, specific, with target limits of quantification (LOQ) below the estimated induction levels and limits of detection (LOD) below the estimated elicitation levels”

Estimated induction levels:
- 5000 ppm taken as a default induction level (based on LLNA EC3 on multiple hydroperoxides)
- Linalool: Up to now lowest elicitation level in humans: 560 ppm (based on one small published ROAT)

• **Revised analytical target** – based on improved analytical methods:

  **50 ppm in final consumer product (defined as ‘reporting level’)**
  - This is 100 fold below default induction level
  - 10-fold below reported tentative elicitation level
  - Note: This lower level is set to have a full understanding and is based on **analytical feasability**: it does not mean that all levels above 50 ppm are of toxicological concern!
Toolbox of methods: GC-MS-reduction method

- GC-MS-reduction method: HP are reduced to corresponding alcohols.
- Alcohols are very stable analytes, which can be analyzed by conventional GC-MS methods.

- This method is very sensitive but conservative, overestimation possible if alcohol is in product.
- Method proven to be highly reproducible by blind-coded multilaboratory trials.
Ring study: Method validation in fine fragrances

- Five labs tested **blind-coded** samples
- Eau de Toilette and Eau de parfum spiked with 4 HP at different levels
- Accurate detection with GC-MS reduction by all five labs
- This method allows accurate quantification in commercial fragrances

Grey squares: Spiked levels
Black diamonds: Found levels
Ring study II: Method validation in creams / lotions

- Five labs tested **blind-coded** samples
- Cream and lotion spiked with 4 HP at different levels
- Accurate detection with GC-MS reduction by all five labs
- This method allows accurate quantification in complex cosmetic products
LC-methods

- LC-method allow to directly detect parent HP
- LC-methods are **more specific** for the hydroperoxides
- More prone to matrix interaction
- Three LC-Methods were further validated as confirmatory methods
- Example of results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EdT No</th>
<th>EdT Low</th>
<th>EdT High</th>
<th>EdP No</th>
<th>EdP Low</th>
<th>EdP High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC-Q-TOF MS</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>279.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPLC-CL</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>310.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>203.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-orbitrap-MS</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>398.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>185.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spike level added</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>322.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>224.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Toolbox of methods: Analytical strategy

- Use versatile, **robust and sensitive** reduction method to screen samples
- Use LC-methods, which are **more specific** for the hydroperoxides, for confirmatory analysis
- Confirmatory analysis for **positive samples above reporting level** by reduction method, as method may be oversensitive
- Confirmatory analysis for **negative samples with high suspicion (patient samples)**
Application of the analytical methods: Market overview and patient’s products

- Detection in final consumer products:
  - Detection in general **market products**
  - ⇒ Presence of potentially sensitizing doses above levels considered safe by QRA?
  - Detection in **aged consumer samples**
  - ⇒ Are products sufficiently protected against oxidation?
  - Detection in **products brought in by patch-test positive patients**
    ⇒ Presence of potentially eliciting doses which may indicate relevance of reaction to actual disease?
Market overview – setup

• Samples from consumer homes, which are partly used

• Products should have declared linalool and limonene content and batch number /production code / date (to ensure traceability)

• For each aged product we searched for a matched fresh product
  – 31 different products (31 fresh and 31 aged, partly used)
  – Fine fragrances, deodorants, creams, lotions

• Samples from patients, collected by Spanish dermatological network
  - Mainly form patch test positive patients
  - If possible, samples also matched with fresh products
  - 28 samples; 11 samples from patients patch test positive to oxidized Linalool and / or oxidizedLimonene

• Specific products with controlled aging

• ‘Aromatherapy’ products

• A specific sample with rel. high level reported in previous study
Market overview – Results aged vs. new samples

- 31 products which could be matched with fresh products (62 samples, analyzed for 4 different hydroperoxides)
- Only one sample above reporting limit: 91 µg/ml of Limonene-1-OH by GC-MS reduction method
- Presence of Limonene-1-OOH verified in this sample by three LC-based methods
- No evidence for HP accumulation in aged samples
- 33% of the analyzed samples contained > 1000 ppm of parent Linalool or limonene
- Compared to the significant level of parent linalool and limonene, HP are either very minor constituents or are not detectable at all in these products
- Aged samples are not more problematic than fresh samples
Results aged vs. new samples: Two products with controlled aging

- 2 products from manufacturer with controlled aging history
- No HP above reporting level
- Trace levels detected, no indication for increased HP level with aging
- No indication for degradation of parent HP

Two commercial fine fragrance samples with defined storage history analysed by the GC-MS-reduction method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Limonene-1-OOH</th>
<th>Limonene-2-OOH</th>
<th>Linalool-7-OOH</th>
<th>Linalool-6-OOH</th>
<th>Limonene</th>
<th>Linalool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfume 1, fresh</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfume 1, 3 years at RT</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfume 1, 3 months, 45°C</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfume 2, fresh</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfume 2, 6 years at RT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfume 2, 3 months, 45°C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&lt;16</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
<td>3900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Indicated are ppm in final product as determined by the GC-MS reduction method
Market overview – Results products from patients

- 28 products obtained from patients over spanish dermatological network, suspected for being causative of reactions

- 11 of these samples were from patients which were positively tested to oxidized linalool or limonene

- None of these samples contained above 50 µg/ml by GC-MS method

- Three LC-MS methods could confirm this result: Absence of significant HP levels in all these products

- Neither induction nor clinical symptoms in these patients can be explained by HP level in the sampled, suspected products

Example of a patient product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample and history of donating patient</th>
<th>Analytical methods</th>
<th>Limonene-1-OOH</th>
<th>Limonene-2-OOH</th>
<th>Linalool-7-OOH</th>
<th>Linalool-6-OOH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O12, Body cream, Positive some fragrances, Positive Limonene ox</td>
<td>GC-MS red. (µg/ml)</td>
<td>&lt;22</td>
<td>&lt;22</td>
<td>&lt;22</td>
<td>&lt;22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GC-MS red. (% recovery)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC-Orbitrap-MS (µg/ml)</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC-Q-ToF-MS (µg/ml)</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC-CL (µg/ml)</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF: Not found
Market overview – results essential oil containing products

• Limited number (five products) which contain essential oils according to declaration

• GC-MS reduction method could detect low amount of target alcohols in these samples

• LC-methods could NOT confirm these results

• The alcohols from HP reduction can be contained at low levels in natural essential oils (oversensitivity of the reduction method)

• See as an example next slide
Aromatherapy product with highest level according reduction method

- Shower oil preparation, from a company specialized on ess. oil containing product
- Claiming ‘**contains 12 essential oils**’, limonene most abundant next to water
  - 21.5% Limonene in final product
  - 4.4% Linalool

### Content of alcohols formed by reduction method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limonene-1-OH</th>
<th>Limonene-2-OH</th>
<th>Linalool-7-OH</th>
<th>Linalool-6-OH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solvias</td>
<td>n.f.</td>
<td>n.f.</td>
<td>n.f.</td>
<td>n.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giv</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Content of hydroperoxides (LC-MS methods)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limonene-1-OOH</th>
<th>Limonene-2-OOH</th>
<th>Linalool-7-OOH</th>
<th>Linalool-6-OOH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC-Q-ToF-MS</td>
<td>n.f.</td>
<td>n.f.</td>
<td>n.f.</td>
<td>n.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-Orbitrap-MS</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-Chemiluminescence</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DECLARATION:** Sulfated castor oil, Aqua (water), **Limonene**, Citrus aurantium dulcis (**orange**) peel oil, Lavandula angustifolia (**lavender**) oil, **Linalool**, *Cinnamomum camphora* **linalooliferum leaf oil**, Citrus aurantium amara (**bitter orange**) leaf/twig oil, Citrus nobilis (**mandarin orange**) peel oil, Cymbopogon martini oil, Origanum majorana flower oil, Cupressus sempervirens oil, Amyris balsamifera bark oil, Anthemis nobilis flower oil, Citrus aurantium amara (**bitter orange**) flower oil, *Lavandula* hybrida grosso herb oil, Geraniol, Citral, Farnesol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limonene</th>
<th>Linalool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solvias</td>
<td>&gt;7000 ppm</td>
<td>&gt;7000 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diluted re-analysis (Giv)</td>
<td>215’177 ppm (21.5%)</td>
<td>43’788 ppm (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Market overview – Results: Re-analysis of a sample analyzed before

• One aftershave sample was recently found to contain 420 Linalool-6-OOH and ca. 20 ppm Linalool-7-OOH by a novel method ¹)

• This is a very unusual isomer ratio not occurring normally during oxidation

• We thus re-analyzed the same sample by all four methods

• Our three LC-methods could not verify the content of this hydroperoxide, much lower levels found by the reduction method

Aftershave analyzed before

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limonene-1-OOH</th>
<th>Limonene-2-OOH</th>
<th>Linalool-7-OOH</th>
<th>Linalool-6-OOH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC-MS red. (µg/ml)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC-MS red. (% recovery)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-Orbitrap-MS (µg/ml)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.r.</td>
<td>ca. 5-10</td>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-Q-ToF-MS (µg/ml)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-CL (µg/ml)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this work we report many negative results: The vast majority of samples does not contain hydroperoxides.

It is very important to validate these results – can we be confident that we can analyze the HP in these very different products?

Thus each sample was analyzed in duplicate – once spiked with all four synthetic hydroperoxides at the reporting level (50 µg / ml).

Spike could always be positively detected (one exception in 416 single determination).

Spike recovery in general > 70%, and close to 100% on average.

Recovery of standard addition (50µg/g) of four HP added to 104 products analysed by the GC-MS-reduction method.
Interpretation – Sensitivity and detected levels vs. toxicological / clinical data

- In general we could not detect and confirm hydroperoxides above reporting limit in great majority of the samples analyzed.

- These negative results were validated by standard addition.

- The first question is: Can the rare occurrence of HP explain the high frequency of positive reactions in terms of frequency of occurrence?

- But what do the figures mean in terms of quantity?

- In one sample we could positively detect 90 µg/g of Limonene-1-OOH.

- We can calculate what this means in terms of dose-per area and compare it to toxicological and clinical data....
Interpretation – Sensitivity and detected levels vs. toxicological / clinical data

Dose per area calculations for limonene-1-OOH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose of hydroperoxide in test preparation</th>
<th>Dose per area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LLNA Dose inducing sensitisation (EC3)</td>
<td>3300 µg/g (0.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patch test limonene-HP *, routine diagnostic level</td>
<td>3300 µg/g (0.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patch test limonene-1-OOH **, diagnostic level</td>
<td>5000 µg/g (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined reporting limit</td>
<td>50 µg/g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical data market survey: (Max. value of n = 104)</td>
<td>90 µg/g (0.009%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mixture of isomers, not specifically 1-OOH-isomer
** Dose used in study on specific Limonene-1-OOH isomer by Christensson, Contact Dermatitis 2015
*** Different dose depending on product type (Cream 10 mg/cm² higher than fine fragrance, 2.2 mg/cm²)
**** Based on the typical application dose of fine fragrance per area

- Even the single positive sample leads to a dose per area exposure which is 400-fold below the inducing level in the LLNA
- Level is 1000-fold below the patch test dose when calculated as dose per area
- Reporting limit is also clearly below induction doses: the puzzle is not about analytical sensitivity
Conclusion

• This Study has significantly extended our knowledge on HP occurrence in Consumer Products

• This is the first study analyzing multiple products from patients

• HP of linalool and limonene are not widespread in consumer products

• Aging of Products has little to no impact on the HP levels found

• *Frequency of occurrence and quantity* (as exposure conc.) of HP cannot yet explain widespread induction / frequent patch test reactions

• An exposure source explaining frequent positive patch test reactions remains elusive
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