

Fragrance wording on dog-grooming labels

Why Parfum and Linalool can appear together, what disclosure means and what it cannot tell you about a dog

EVIDENCE STATUS

Organization-authored structured evidence map. No statistical pooling was performed because the retained evidence units were heterogeneous or non-quantitative. This is not a meta-analysis, systematic review or peer-reviewed paper.

PREPARED BY

Cori Dog (organization author)

SUGGESTED CITATION

Cori Dog. Fragrance wording on dog-grooming labels. Cori Dog Research Notes, version 1.1; reviewed 27 August 2026.
<https://coridog.com/journal/research-notes/fragrance-wording-dog-grooming-labels>

SCOPE BOUNDARY

Educational evidence synthesis only. Not veterinary advice, legal advice, a product recommendation, a safety verdict or a Cori formula disclosure.

Accessible canonical HTML: <https://coridog.com/journal/research-notes/fragrance-wording-dog-grooming-labels>

Fixed-version PDF: <https://coridog.com/journal/research/fragrance-wording-dog-grooming-labels.pdf>

Related Journal guide: <https://coridog.com/journal/dog-shampoo-ingredients-explained>

The short answer

BOTTOM LINE

Parfum can name a fragrance composition while Linalool can be listed separately under an applicable disclosure convention. Their appearance together can be normal label architecture rather than duplication. The words alone do not reveal dose, source, exposure, tolerability, legal compliance or risk for a dog.

Why this matters

Readers often treat a disclosed name as either a warning or proof of transparency. Disclosure answers a narrower question: which names a particular framework requires or permits on that product label.

Biological tolerance is a separate question. It depends on concentration, complete formulation, product format, exposure and the individual animal. Human-cosmetics thresholds and industry standards cannot be converted into canine safety scores.

Four takeaways

01 Parfum and Linalool do not automatically mean duplication

Parfum can represent a fragrance composition. A named scent material may also need separate disclosure under the applicable convention. The two labels can perform different disclosure functions.

Sources 1, 2, 5, 6.

02 EU human-cosmetic thresholds are disclosure triggers

Regulation (EU) 2023/1545 uses 0.001% for leave-on and 0.01% for rinse-off human cosmetics for listed substances. These thresholds govern naming in that context; they are not canine risk limits.

Source 2.

03 A transition period can explain different labels now

Non-compliant human cosmetics could be placed on the EU market until 31 July 2026 and may remain available until 31 July 2028. Products seen during the transition may therefore follow different label versions.

Source 2.

04 Disclosure does not establish exposure or tolerance

The label does not reveal exact concentration, fragrance source, persistence, rinse behaviour or whether a dog will tolerate the finished product. Relevant finished-product evidence remains necessary.

Sources 4, 7.

Key terms and a worked example

Technical vocabulary is useful only when readers can see what each term adds to the question. These definitions are intentionally narrow.

Perfume composition	A mixture used to impart or mask odour. A broad label term can represent that composition without listing every component under the same name.
Named fragrance material	An individual substance name that may be disclosed separately when an applicable labelling rule or convention requires it.
Disclosure threshold	A concentration point at which a framework requires a name to appear. It is not automatically a toxicological threshold or safety verdict.
Placed on the market	The first making available of a product in the relevant market. This differs from a product continuing to be made available later in the supply chain.

Example: one fictional rinse-off label

A fictional rinse-off dog shampoo sold in an EU market lists both Parfum and Linalool. A reader concludes that Linalool was added twice and that the product is unsafe.

- 1. The label supports neither conclusion. Parfum may identify the fragrance composition while Linalool is disclosed separately under the label convention used. The same vocabulary can be borrowed from human cosmetics without importing every human-cosmetics rule into pet grooming.
- 2. The list still does not show exact concentration, source, total exposure after rinsing or individual tolerance. Market, product classification and the applicable pet-product framework must be established first.

BOUNDARY

This example explains label architecture only. It is not legal advice, a fragrance assessment or a statement that the fictional product complies with any market rule.

Sources 1, 2, 5, 6.

Deeper analysis

This section connects the sources without treating different study designs, standards or regulatory documents as interchangeable.

Why a broad term and a specific name can coexist

Parfum is broad by design: it can identify a fragrance composition used to impart or mask odour. Linalool is one named material with reported perfuming and deodorant functions in CosIng.

Under a disclosure framework, an individual material can appear separately even when it is associated with the perfume composition. The two words therefore need not mean that a formulator added the same material twice.

Sources 5, 6, 1.

A threshold answers a labelling question

Regulation (EU) 2023/1545 sets disclosure thresholds of 0.001% in leave-on and 0.01% in rinse-off human cosmetics for listed substances. Crossing a threshold can change whether a name must appear on that human-cosmetic label.

It does not follow that a value below the threshold is universally safe, that a value above it is unsafe, or that the same threshold governs a dog-grooming product. Disclosure, hazard, exposure and individual response are separate questions.

Source 2.

Transition dates explain some real-world label differences

The amendment allowed non-compliant human cosmetics to be placed on the Union market until 31 July 2026 and to remain available until 31 July 2028. At this review date, products already in the supply chain may therefore still carry earlier label presentations.

That timing can explain difference without proving compliance. A legal conclusion still requires the exact product, placement history, classification and market.

Source 2.

Pet-grooming context must be established separately

A dog-grooming label may borrow human-cosmetics vocabulary because the names are familiar to formulators and suppliers. Vocabulary alone does not determine the governing product category.

The reader should first identify the country, intended use, product claims and classification. FDA guidance illustrates this in the United States by linking animal-grooming status to intended use; other markets have their own frameworks.

Sources 3, 8.

No canine tolerance conclusion follows from disclosure

None of the sources in this map tests the tolerance of a named fragrance concentration in a marketed dog-grooming product. The regulatory and terminology sources explain words; the IFRA source explains an industry stewardship system.

A canine tolerance claim would need relevant finished-product evidence describing formulation, exposure, population, outcomes and adverse events. Until then, the label can support a question about disclosure, not a prediction for an individual dog.

Sources 4, 7.

Evidence map

Rows keep each source's useful contribution beside the conclusion it cannot support. Citation numbers refer to the source register.

SOURCE	DESIGN / SCOPE	WHAT IT CONTRIBUTES	IMPORTANT LIMIT
EU Cosmetics Regulation Source 1.	Human cosmetics	Provides the ingredient-list framework, including use of perfume-composition terminology.	Does not automatically govern dog-grooming products.
Regulation (EU) 2023/1545 Source 2.	Human-cosmetic fragrance-allergen disclosure	Updates named-substance disclosure, thresholds and transition dates.	A disclosure trigger is not a canine risk score or finished-product tolerance test.
Decision (EU) 2025/1175 Source 3.	Common human-cosmetics ingredient names	Provides current terminology used in EU human-cosmetic ingredient lists.	A common name does not establish approval, concentration or pet-product applicability.
CosIng records: Parfum and Linalool Sources 5, 6, 4.	Official informative database	Reports perfuming functions and a deodorant function for Linalool.	Records do not reveal source, dose, finished-product exposure or tolerability.
IFRA Code of Practice Source 7.	Industry self-regulation	Describes an industry standards system for fragrance materials.	Not universal law, pet-product approval or finished-product canine certification.
FDA animal-grooming guidance Source 8.	United States intended-use context	Shows that intended use and claims can affect product status.	US-specific and not a fragrance-tolerance assessment or legal advice for other markets.

INTERPRETATION RULE

Terminology or mechanism evidence can generate a question. A defined finished-product claim needs evidence from the relevant finished product and conditions of use. None of those evidence units becomes a diagnosis.

Method and review question

REVIEW QUESTION

Why might Parfum and Linalool both appear on a label, and which conclusions remain unsupported without product and market context?

SEARCH SCOPE

Official EU human-cosmetics terminology and labelling sources, an industry code and US animal-grooming guidance were compared as distinct contexts. Rules, transition dates and voluntary systems were kept separate rather than merged into one universal standard.

Recorded discovery routes

- EU official sources: Parfum, Linalool and fragrance-allergen labelling
- Official US guidance: FDA animal grooming aids
- Industry source: IFRA Code of Practice

Search recorded 27 August 2026. The source register reports 8 retained sources. Exact candidate and exclusion counts are not claimed because a public screening log was not maintained.

Exclusion boundary

Allergy-ranking pages, essential-oil marketing, unsourced safety lists and sources that did not identify the legal or self-regulatory context were excluded.

Synthesis decision

Cross-context terminology and disclosure map. EU human-cosmetics rules, US intended-use guidance and voluntary industry practice are described separately. No sensitisation or tolerance effect was estimated because the source set contains no comparable canine outcome studies.

REPORTING REGIME

This is a targeted, single-organization evidence map. Search routes, retained sources, source links beside each takeaway, the worked example, every evidence row and each deeper-analysis section, and limitations are disclosed. The note does not claim exhaustive searching, duplicate screening or full systematic-review compliance.

Questions for evidence users

Use these questions to test whether a conclusion is proportionate to the product, population, method and endpoint that were actually studied.

1	Which market and product classification governed the label?
2	Is Parfum being used as a broad perfume-composition term?
3	Which rule or convention explains separate disclosure of the named material?
4	Was the product placed on the market during a relevant transition period?
5	What finished-product evidence supports scent intensity, persistence or tolerance language?
6	Are legal rules, voluntary standards and biological evidence clearly separated?

What stronger claims would need

- A compliance statement needs market-specific professional review of the exact product, timing, label and claims.
- A canine tolerance claim needs relevant finished-product evidence; disclosure alone is not evidence of effect.
- A free-from or allergy implication needs a precisely defined scope, analytical or formulation evidence, and careful market review.

Limitations and sources

Limitations

- This comparison explains terminology and disclosure context; it is not legal advice or a fragrance safety assessment.
- The map does not assess concentrations, impurities, exposure, formulation or individual animals.
- The search was targeted and not independently duplicated.
- No canine fragrance-tolerance study was included, so no canine effect estimate is available.
- A meta-analysis is not relevant to legal texts, terminology records and an industry code.

Source register

1. Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009

EU human-cosmetics framework. [Open source](#)

2. Regulation (EU) 2023/1545

Human-cosmetic fragrance-allergen labelling amendment, thresholds and transition dates. [Open source](#)

3. Decision (EU) 2025/1175

Current common ingredient names for EU human cosmetics. [Open source](#)

4. European Commission CosIng database

Informative and non-binding human-cosmetics ingredient database. [Open source](#)

5. CosIng record: Parfum

Reported perfuming function. [Open source](#)

6. CosIng record: Linalool

Reported perfuming and deodorant functions. [Open source](#)

7. IFRA Code of Practice

Fragrance-industry self-regulatory context. [Open source](#)

8. FDA CPG Sec. 653.100 Animal Grooming Aids

US intended-use and claims context. [Open source](#)

CORRECTIONS AND UPDATES

This is version 1.1 of a living research note. Material source additions, corrections or scope changes produce a new version and review date. The accessible HTML page is the canonical source of truth.

Correction policy: [Cori Dog editorial method](#)