How to Choose Leak-Resistant Packaging for Oil-Based Products

Bottle, closure, liner and validation decisions

for cosmetics, supplements and pet-health formulations

Written by: Eleni Hatziemmanouil | **Technical review by:** Dr Georgios Tsatsos
Published: September 2026 | **Version:** 1.0

IN SHORT: Leak resistance depends on the complete container-closure system. The bottle, closure, liner, neck finish, insert and application conditions must work together and be assessed with the actual formulation.

Category: Packaging | Format: Technical guide | Audience: Brand owners, product developers, QA, procurement and operations

How to Choose Leak-Resistant Packaging for Oil-Based Products

Choosing a bottle is only one part of the packaging decision. For an oil-based product, reliable performance depends on the complete system: container material, neck finish, closure geometry, liner or seal, dispensing insert, application torque and the behaviour of the actual formulation.

Key takeaways

- Leak resistance is a property of the complete container-closure system, not of one component in isolation.
- A cap that feels tight is not necessarily sealed. Extra torque cannot reliably compensate for an unsuitable liner, damaged bottle finish or mismatched closure.
- A compressible liner may help accommodate dimensional variation, but its material must remain stable in contact with the formulation.
- Induction sealing can provide initial leak protection and tamper evidence, but the sealing layer must match the container material.
- The final system should be assessed with the actual formulation, production-representative components and relevant storage and transport challenges.

Why oils expose weak closure systems

Oil readily spreads across surfaces and can reveal very small leak paths between the bottle finish, closure and sealing element. A pack that appears acceptable upright may behave differently when stored horizontally, exposed to reduced pressure, transported through temperature changes or subjected to vibration. Visible signs can include product around the threads, oil inside the cap, label staining or a gradual loss of fill weight.

- Insufficient or uneven liner compression
- Mismatch between bottle neck finish and closure specification
- Surface irregularities or dimensional variation on the sealing land
- Application torque outside the assessed range
- Product on the rim or threads during filling
- Headspace pressure changes during storage or transport
- A dispensing insert that affects closure seating
- Testing limited to upright storage under ambient conditions

Can a rigid PP or HDPE cap seal a rigid bottle?

Not without a liner or seal. A rigid closure can be used successfully with glass or plastic containers when the design creates and maintains sealing pressure around the full circumference of the bottle finish. Depending on the system, sealing may be created by a compressible liner, plug seal, bore seal, cone seal, induction foil or a combination of features.

> **IMPORTANT DISTINCTION:** Softness alone is not a material specification. The exact liner grade, construction, thickness, product-contact surface, documentation and formulation compatibility should be known before approval.

Closure and sealing options

The following options are starting points, not universal recommendations. Selection depends on formulation, container material, neck finish, intended use, distribution route and applicable contact-material requirements.

System	Potential benefit	Main limitation
PP cap with foamed PE liner	Compressibility and resealing for many formulations.	Does not provide tamper evidence by itself; exact grade still requires assessment.
Faced compressible liner, multilayer	Compliant backing with a more resistant product-contact face.	Performance depends on the facing, backing and adhesive construction.
One-piece induction seal	Strong initial seal and tamper evidence.	Does not necessarily provide a secondary reseal after opening.
Two-piece induction liner	Initial induction seal plus a liner retained for reclosure.	Adds components and process variables.
Engineered plug or bore seal	Seals against the inner neck diameter.	Highly dependent on matched geometry.
Pressure-sensitive liner	Simple application without induction equipment.	Generally not the preferred primary leak barrier for oils and many liquids.
Unlined rigid cap	Lower component count.	Limited ability to accommodate variation unless an engineered seal is present.

Why liner material should not be selected by softness alone

A liner must provide enough compression to accommodate the sealing surfaces and enough resilience to maintain pressure over time. It must also be compatible with the complete oil phase. Vegetable oils, hydrocarbons, fragrances, essential oils and lipophilic ingredients can interact differently with polymeric materials.

Supplier compatibility information is useful for screening, but it does not demonstrate performance of the final marketed pack. Final approval should be based on the exact formulation, components and defined assessment conditions.

Real ANAVERIS packaging case studies

The following examples use real photographs from supplied ANAVERIS packaging records. They illustrate how complete packaging systems are considered. These examples do not claim universal suitability or performance outside the documented component configuration.

Case study 1: Amber glass bottle with DIN18 dispensing system—design review and experimental validation

The recorded configuration comprised a 50 ml amber glass bottle, a DIN18 LDPE dropper and an HDPE safety cap with a specially shaped internal feature. The feature was intended to surround the raised edge of the DIN18 dropper and create a direct seal; however, this configuration did not provide reliable leak resistance.

The successful solution was a cap incorporating an expanded polyethylene (EPE) foam sealing disc. Under closure torque, the compressible disc formed a more uniform sealing interface over the dropper and helped accommodate dimensional variation between components.

 *Open bottle with the dispensing insert fitted.*	 *DIN18 dispensing insert.*	 *Inside of the closure showing the sealing EPE foam interface.*

Experimental evidence and why sample size matters

A related ANAVERIS assessment provides experimental evidence for this principle. An oil-based product was filled into 50 ml glass bottles fitted with a DIN18 inner dropper and a polypropylene closure. Although the assembled packs appeared acceptable during normal handling, horizontal storage under a partial vacuum of 250 mmHg for 2 hours resulted in leakage from the closure area in 8% of the tested packs. A result of this type may not be detected when only two or three bottles are examined: at an observed failure rate of 8%, such a small sample could easily contain no leaking unit and create false confidence in the packaging system. A larger, predefined sample is therefore essential for identifying occasional leakage and component-to-component variation; as an initial practical screening point, testing at least 20 production-representative bottles provides a more meaningful basis than testing only two or three, while final validation should still be defined according to product risk, batch size, distribution route and acceptance criteria.

Interpretation, corrective action and limits

This finding demonstrates the effect of changing the sealing interface in this specific bottle–closure system; it does not establish that every DIN18 pack requires the same disc or that one disc material is suitable for every oil. The conclusion remains limited to the tested formulation, bottle, inner dropper, closure, sealing disc, torque and test conditions.

PRACTICAL LEARNING: A closure geometry that appears technically sound may still fail under challenge testing. In this case, the specially shaped closure leaked, whereas the EPE foam sealing disc achieved the required seal. Evaluate alternative configurations using a sufficiently large, production-representative sample under predefined conditions that reflect intended storage, transport and use.

Case study 2: Amber PET bottle with tamper-evident closure and pourer

The recorded configuration used an amber PET bottle with a tamper-evident HDPE closure and an LDPE pourer. The original assembly shown in Figure 1 appeared correctly fitted but occasionally leaked during use. A second assembly, shown in Figure 2, was then tested using a closure with moulded internal ribs; this configuration worked successfully under the assessed conditions.

Figure 1. Bottle, pourer and closure assembly

Figure 1. Oil-filled bottle fitted with an internal pourer and screw closure. The pourer remains permanently retained in the bottle neck while the closure is removed.

The comparison shows that sealing performance did not depend solely on closure torque. In the original Figure 1 assembly, the interaction between the pourer, closure and bottle finish did not consistently maintain an effective seal during use. The Figure 2 closure introduced internal ribs that controlled compression and load transfer during tightening, and the modified assembly worked successfully under the assessed conditions.

Figure 2. Internal closure ribs acting as mechanical stops

Figure 2. Magnified view inside the closure showing the moulded internal ribs, a critical design feature for leak-resistant oil packaging.

The ribs perform three complementary functions:

1. **Torque control.** The ribs act as built-in mechanical stops. As the cap is tightened, the ribs contact the upper surface of the pourer before excessive force can be transmitted to the sealing area. This helps prevent operators or automated capping equipment from over-compressing the system.
2. **Load distribution.** Rather than concentrating closing force at one point, the ribs distribute the load around the circumference of the closure. This reduces local deformation of the cap and pourer and helps maintain uniform sealing pressure.
3. **Seal protection.** The ribs maintain a controlled distance between the cap and the primary sealing interface. Once the designed contact point is reached, additional torque mainly increases thread loading instead of crushing the sealing geometry. The system therefore becomes less sensitive to normal variation in capping torque.

How the seal is actually formed

In this package design, the leakage barrier is not created by the ribs themselves. The actual seal is generated by the interaction between the bottle neck finish, the pourer sealing surfaces and the closure geometry. The ribs keep these components within their designed compression range.

Without these ribs, excessive cap torque could:

- distort the pourer geometry;
- create uneven compression;
- generate micro-leak paths; and
- increase leakage risk during transport or temperature cycling.

The development sequence therefore moved from the occasionally leaking assembly shown in Figure 1 to the successful rib-supported closure shown in Figure 2. The result indicates that controlling the mechanical interaction between the closure and pourer corrected the leakage observed with the original configuration under the assessed conditions.

Key engineering lesson

PRACTICAL LEARNING: The original assembly in Figure 1 occasionally leaked during use, whereas the rib-supported closure tested in Figure 2 worked successfully under the assessed conditions. This comparison shows that internal structural features can be critical: the ribs controlled compression and load transfer at the sealing interface instead of relying on additional torque alone. The result remains specific to the tested bottle, pourer, closure, formulation and use conditions and should be confirmed through representative validation.

Case study 3: PET-G bottle with spray closure and EPE sealing disc

The recorded configuration used a transparent PET-G bottle, a spray closure and an expanded polyethylene (EPE) foam sealing disc. Unlike Cases 1 and 2, this example does not compare an unsuccessful assembly with a corrective design. It demonstrates a configuration that worked successfully under the assessed conditions and illustrates how a compressible sealing element can support leak resistance in a spray pack.

Figure 1. Transparent PET-G spray pack used in the successful configuration; visible label information has been anonymised.

Figure 2. Inside of the spray closure showing the EPE foam sealing disc at the neck-sealing interface.

Figure 3. Side view of the spray closure and dip tube, showing the complete dispensing assembly.

How the successful seal is formed

PRACTICAL LEARNING: A case study does not need to begin with a failed closure to provide useful engineering evidence. This PET-G spray pack demonstrates a configuration that worked successfully under the assessed conditions because the bottle finish, spray closure and compressible EPE foam disc functioned as one sealing system. The result remains specific to the tested formulation, components, application conditions and use scenario and should be confirmed through representative validation.

How should an oil-based pack be assessed?

A short upright observation is insufficient to demonstrate packaging performance. Depending on the product, intended distribution, and regulatory context, a risk-based program may include testing closed packs under a controlled pressure differential. The method should specify whether the pressure is absolute or relative to atmospheric pressure, the exposure duration, the test orientation, and the acceptance criteria. For example, packs may be assessed in a horizontal or inverted position using a validated reduced-pressure leak-test method.

- Upright, horizontal and inverted storage
- Controlled partial-vacuum or pressure-differential testing
- Application and removal torque measurements
- Temperature cycling and storage at relevant conditions
- Transport, vibration or drop assessments where appropriate
- Inspection for liner swelling, softening, hardening or distortion
- Monitoring for product loss, thread contamination or label staining
- Induction-seal integrity where applicable
- Compatibility and stability assessment in the final commercial pack
- Repeated-opening assessment where the closure must reseal

Define the method, sample size, conditioning, observations and pass/fail criteria before testing begins. Testing only two or three bottles is unlikely to reveal occasional leakage, component variation or handling-related effects. For initial practical screening, at least 20 production-representative bottles may provide a more informative starting point, but the final validation sample size should be justified according to product risk, expected defect rate, batch size, distribution route and acceptance criteria. Transport simulation should be performed under controlled and documented conditions that reproduce relevant orientation, vibration and temperature stresses.

If a failure is corrected, assess the modified configuration under the same conditions used for the original assembly and, where justified, under more demanding conditions. Keep the formulation, component lots, conditioning, orientation, exposure time, measurement method and acceptance criteria controlled so that any improvement can be attributed to the packaging change. A reduced-pressure leak tester may be used to challenge closed packs, provided that the applied pressure differential, exposure duration and pack orientation are defined and documented.

A practical six-step selection process

1. Characterise the formulation Record the oil types, fragrances, essential oils, solvents, lipophilic ingredients, viscosity and oxidation sensitivity.

2. Define use and distribution Consider storage orientation, transport, temperature, altitude or pressure changes, dosing method and repeated opening.

3. Select container and neck finish Confirm material, neck-finish standard, dimensions, tolerances, sealing-land quality and supplier reference.

4. Select closure and sealing mechanism Review liner, disc, plug, induction seal, dropper, reducer, pump or combination as one dimensional stack.

5. Establish production parameters Define fill conditions, headspace, rim cleanliness, application torque and process controls.

6. Assess and approve the final system Test the actual formulation in production-representative packs under defined storage, transport and use conditions. Document the test method, sample size, component lots, application settings, observations, acceptance criteria and approval decision so that the assessment can be repeated after a relevant change.

Common mistakes and better practice

Common mistake	Better practice
Choosing the bottle first and the cap later	Treat the container, insert, closure and liner as one sourced and assessed system.
Assuming more torque always improves sealing	Establish and validate an application-torque window for the complete pack. Insufficient torque may leave an incomplete seal, while excessive torque can deform the closure or insert, damage the threads, reduce removal performance or cause stress cracking during storage.
Relying on a water test	Use the real formulation because oils, fragrances and ingredients may interact differently with sealing materials.
Testing only upright	Include challenge orientations relevant to transport and consumer use.
Specifying “rubber” or “polyurethane” generically	Approve the exact material grade, construction, thickness, documentation and supplier reference.
Changing one component without reassessment	Review performance whenever the formula, component, supplier or critical setting changes.

Frequently asked questions

Why can oil leak even when the cap feels tight?

Cap tightness reflects resistance to rotation, not necessarily uniform sealing pressure. A leak path may remain because of liner compression, bottle-finish variation, insert interference, contamination or incompatibility.

What is the best liner for an oil-based product?

There is no universal best liner for an oil-based product. Selection should consider the formulation chemistry, bottle finish, closure design, required reseal performance and intended storage and distribution conditions. Supplier compatibility data can support initial screening, but the exact liner and complete pack should be assessed with the marketed formulation before approval.

Does every oil bottle need an induction seal?

No. Induction sealing can be useful when initial leak protection and tamper evidence are priorities, but it must match the container material and closure system.

Is any package completely leak-proof?

“Leak-proof” is an absolute claim. A more defensible objective is a leak-resistant pack that meets predefined acceptance criteria under defined storage, transport and use conditions.

When should packaging be reassessed?

Reassess the packaging system after any change that could affect fit, sealing pressure, material compatibility or process capability. Relevant changes include the formulation, bottle, neck finish, closure, liner, dispensing insert, supplier, tooling, filling conditions, application-torque settings and induction-sealing parameters. The scope of reassessment should be based on the risk introduced by the change.