IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)
e-ISSN: 2279-0853, p-ISSN: 2279-0861.Volume 25, Issue 3 Ser. 3 (March. 2026), PP 66-73
www.iosrjournals.org

Blue Light Protective Serums: A Comprehensive Review On Cutaneous Impact, Mechanisms, Formulation Strategies, Evaluation Approaches, And Future Directions

Preethi Kattupalli, P. Srinivasa Babu, Sri Lakshmi, Padmini, Deekshitha, Yamini, Tharun Kumar.
Assistant Professor, Vignan Pharmacy College, Vadlamudi, A.P, India.

Abstract
High-energy visible (HEV) blue light (400–490 nm) has emerged as an important environmental stressor due to prolonged exposure from digital devices and LED lighting systems [19, 22]. Although less energetic than ultraviolet radiation, HEV wavelengths induce oxidative stress, inflammation, pigmentation, mitochondrial dysfunction, and early skin aging [3, 12, 20]. Blue-light protective serums are increasingly formulated to mitigate HEV-induced effects using antioxidants, pigments, botanical actives, peptides, and advanced delivery systems [14, 21, 26].
The present review synthesizes HEV–skin interaction mechanisms [8, 12, 17], summarizes protective strategies [10, 14, 15], and evaluates formulation approaches and challenges [18, 23, 24]. Despite growing evidence, the absence of standardized HEV protection factors and long-term clinical validation remains a key limitation [19, 22]. Future innovations include opsin-3–modulating actives, mitochondria-targeted antioxidants, sustainable pigments, and AI-guided personalized formulations [7, 13, 28].

Keywords: *Blue light, HEV radiation, Photodamage, Skin aging, Antioxidants, Opsin-3, Cosmetic formulation, Iron oxide pigments, Mitochondrial stress*

Date of Submission: 08-03-2026 Date of Acceptance: 18-03-2026

I. Introduction

With global dependency on electronic devices, cutaneous exposure to HEV blue light has increased substantially [19]. Digital screens, LED lighting, and compact fluorescent lamps emit significant amounts of 400–490 nm wavelengths capable of inducing oxidative and inflammatory responses in human skin [3, 20, 27]. Although ultraviolet radiation remains the primary focus of photoprotection research (6, 11), visible-light–mediated dermatological effects are now well-documented [8, 16, 19].

Blue light penetrates the epidermis and upper dermis where endogenous chromophores—including flavins, porphyrins, and melanin—absorb HEV energy and generate oxidative stress [3, 22]. Persistent pigmentation is particularly prominent in darker skin phototypes through opsin-3 (OPN3)–mediated melanogenic pathways [8, 16]. Studies show that HEV exposure increases melanin, upregulates tyrosinase, elevates ROS, disrupts mitochondrial respiration, and weakens barrier integrity [12, 20, 27]. These findings establish HEV light as a contributor to premature photoaging [4, 10].

Consequently, blue-light shield serums—cosmeceuticals designed to reduce HEV-associated oxidative and pigmentary stress—have gained significant commercial and scientific interest [14, 26]. These formulations rely on a combination of optical attenuators such as iron oxides [15], antioxidants [21, 26], botanical chromophores [18], peptides [24], and delivery systems including nanoemulsions, liposomes, and lipid nanoparticles [28].

Yet, scientific challenges persist, including limited consensus on irradiation protocols, incomplete knowledge of opsin signaling, lack of standardized HEV protection metrics, and insufficient long-term clinical datasets [19, 22, 24]. This review integrates current knowledge and highlights opportunities for the advancement of HEV-targeted cosmeceuticals.

II. Skin Interaction With Blue Light: Biological Basis

Penetration and Chromophore Activation

HEV blue light penetrates into the epidermis and superficial dermis, interacting with endogenous chromophores such as flavins, porphyrins, NADH/NADPH, and melanin [3, 12, 19]. These chromophores absorb HEV wavelengths, generating reactive oxygen species (ROS), which initiate oxidative chain reactions and contribute to cellular stress [3, 12].

Unlike ultraviolet B, which has shallow penetration, HEV light reaches viable keratinocytes and melanocytes, producing deeper photochemical effects [8, 17].

Oxidative Stress and Mitochondrial Dysfunction

Blue light induces significant ROS production, including superoxide anions and singlet oxygen (12, 20). ROS accumulation leads to lipid peroxidation, protein oxidation, and mitochondrial DNA damage [(12)].

Studies show that HEV exposure reduces mitochondrial membrane potential, impairs ATP production, and induces mitochondrial fragmentation [(20, 27)]. These changes collectively weaken cellular energy metabolism and accelerate skin fatigue and aging [(10, 27)].

Pigmentation via the Opsin-3 (OPN3) Pathway

Visible light–induced pigmentation differs mechanistically from UV-induced tanning. Blue light activates opsin-3 (OPN3), a G protein–coupled receptor in melanocytes [(8, 16)]. OPN3 activation increases intracellular calcium levels, upregulates MITF, and enhances tyrosinase activity, resulting in persistent pigmentation, particularly in darker skin phototypes [(8, 16, 18)].This persistent hyperpigmentation can last weeks to months and is more intense than UVA-induced pigmentation [(8, 17)].

Barrier Impairment

HEV exposure decreases filaggrin expression, alters ceramide organization, and disrupts corneocyte cohesion, collectively weakening barrier function [(12, 20)]. In vivo studies show increased transepidermal water loss (TEWL) and reduced stratum corneum hydration following repeated HEV exposure [(17, 19, 24)]. These changes justify the inclusion of barrier-repairing ingredients in blue-light shield serums.

III. Mechanisms Of Protection In Blue Light Shield Serums

Optical Attenuation and Physical Filtration

Ingredients such as iron oxides (red, yellow, black) and melanin analogues attenuate HEV wavelengths by absorbing visible light and reducing photon penetration into the skin [(15, 23)].Microalgae-derived pigments (e.g., phycocyanin and fucoxanthin) also provide natural HEV filtering with documented antioxidant activity [(18, 21)]. This optical defense is crucial because HEV protection cannot rely on traditional UV chemical filters [(19)].

Antioxidant Defense Against ROS

Antioxidants counteract ROS generated by HEV radiation. Effective molecules include:

- Vitamin C and derivatives [(21)]
- Vitamin E (tocopherols) [(14)]
- Ferulic acid [(14, 21)]
- Carotenoids such as lutein, beta-carotene, and astaxanthin [(26)]
- Polyphenols like quercetin and rutin [(21, 26)]

Synergistic combinations reduce lipid peroxidation and maintain cellular redox balance [(21)].

Opsin-3 Modulation

Early evidence suggests that niacinamide, peptides, and certain botanical extracts modulate OPN3 expression and reduce HEV-induced melanogenesis [(16, 18, 24)]. This pathway is increasingly important in preventing persistent visible light pigmentation.

Mitochondrial Protection

Mitochondria-targeted antioxidants such as coenzyme Q10, idebenone, and MitoQ help preserve mitochondrial membrane potential and ATP production [(20, 28)]. Encapsulated forms enhance penetration and stability within the mitochondrial environment [(28)].

Anti-inflammatory and Cytokine Regulation

HEV exposure induces IL-6, IL-8, and COX-2 expression, contributing to low-grade inflammation [(3,12,27)]. Anti-inflammatory peptides, botanical extracts, and flavonoids mitigate cytokine release and support skin homeostasis [(14, 21)].

Barrier Reinforcement

Ceramides, cholesterol, phytosphingosine, hyaluronic acid, and lamellar emulsions repair HEV-induced barrier disturbances [(19,24)]. Their inclusion in serums helps restore TEWL and strengthen resilience against environmental stressors.

IV. Formulation Strategies

Developing a blue-light protective serum requires an integrated approach involving the selection of HEV-active ingredients, stabilization techniques, delivery system optimization, and ensuring compatibility with cosmetic sensorial expectations [(14, 18, 21)].

Selection of Active Ingredients

Optical Attenuators

Optical HEV-blocking agents function by absorbing or scattering visible photons, thus reducing their penetration into the epidermis.

- **Iron oxides** (yellow, red, black) are the most widely used attenuators, offering coverage across the blue–visible spectrum [15, 23].
- **Melanin analogues** and biomimetic pigments mimic endogenous melanin's broad-spectrum absorbance [25].
- **Microalgae pigments**, such as phycocyanin and fucoxanthin, provide natural HEV absorption and potent antioxidant properties [18, 21].

Although pigments are effective, their use requires sensorial optimization to avoid undesirable tint or residue [15, 23].

Antioxidants

Antioxidants remain the cornerstone of HEV protection due to their ability to neutralize ROS.
Common ingredients include:

- L-ascorbic acid and its derivatives [21]
- Tocopherols (Vitamin E) [14]
- Ferulic acid [14, 21]
- Polyphenols such as quercetin, rutin, and catechins [21, 26]
- Carotenoids including lutein, beta-carotene, and astaxanthin [26]

Synergistic blends (e.g., Vitamin C + E + ferulic acid) enhance stability and regenerative capacity [14, 21].

Anti-pigmentation Agents

Agents that downregulate melanogenesis are critical for preventing HEV-induced pigmentation.

- **Niacinamide** regulates melanosome transfer and may reduce OPN3-mediated pigmentation [16, 24].
- **Botanical extracts** (e.g., licorice flavonoids, arbutin-containing plants) exhibit tyrosinase inhibition and antioxidant synergy [18, 26].
- **Peptides** targeting MITF signaling have emerged as promising HEV-specific depigmenting agents [24].

Barrier-Reinforcing Ingredients

HEV light compromises ceramides and barrier lipids [12, 20]. Therefore, serums should include:

- Ceramides (NP, AP, EOP)
- Cholesterol
- Phytosphingosine
- Hyaluronic acid
- Lamellar-structure emulsifiers

These ingredients restore stratum corneum integrity and reduce TEWL increases observed after HEV exposure [19, 24].

Mitochondrial Protective Agents

Mitochondrial antioxidants such as coenzyme Q10, idebenone, and MitoQ protect against HEV-induced mitochondrial depolarization and ATP reduction [20, 28]. Encapsulation is often required to ensure stability and deeper delivery [28].

Delivery System Optimization

Liposomes and Niosomes

Encapsulation within phospholipid vesicles enhances penetration, protects unstable antioxidants, and allows controlled release [28].

Nanoemulsions

High-energy or low-energy nanoemulsion techniques increase surface area, improving both solubility and stability of lipophilic HEV-active compounds [18, 26].

Solid Lipid Nanoparticles (SLNs) and Nanostructured Lipid Carriers (NLCs)

These delivery systems improve bioavailability of antioxidants and maintain sustained release for longer photoprotection [28].

Cyclodextrin Complexes

Cyclodextrins enhance solubility of hydrophobic antioxidants and improve sensory aesthetics in serums [26].

Formulation Base Selection

Water-Based Serums

Suitable for hydrophilic antioxidants (Vitamin C), peptides, and botanical extracts [14, 21]. Offer lightweight, fast-absorbing aesthetics preferred for daytime use.

Anhydrous Serums

Silicone or oil-based systems protect labile molecules (e.g., pure ascorbic acid) from oxidation [14]. Also improve pigment dispersion [15].

Emulsion-Based Serums (O/W, W/O)

Provide flexibility for integrating both hydrophilic and lipophilic HEV protectants [18, 26]. Lamellar emulsions mimic stratum corneum structure and enhance barrier repair [24].

Stabilization Techniques

pH Control

Vitamin C derivatives require acidic stabilization, while polyphenols require neutral-to-slightly-acidic pH [21].

Chelating Agents

EDTA and phytic acid prevent metal-induced oxidation of antioxidants [21, 26].

Encapsulation

Microencapsulation of antioxidants and pigments prevents degradation and improves compatibility with serum systems [28].

Antioxidant Synergy Networks

Using multiple antioxidants regenerates oxidized forms, extending photoprotective longevity [14, 21].

V. Evaluation Methods

Assessment of blue-light protective serums requires a combination of ***in vitro***, ***ex vivo***, and ***in vivo*** techniques to evaluate optical attenuation, antioxidative activity, pigmentation control, barrier restoration, mitochondrial preservation, and overall photoprotection [19, 22, 23]. Due to the absence of standardized HEV-protection indices, diverse methodologies are used across research settings [22, 24].

In Vitro Evaluation Methods

UV–Vis Spectrophotometry

Spectrophotometric analysis quantifies the HEV absorption spectrum of pigments, antioxidants, and botanical chromophores [15, 22]. Iron oxides and melanin analogues show strong absorbance in the 400–490 nm range [15, 23].

ROS Quantification Assays

HEV-exposed keratinocytes or fibroblasts are analyzed using ROS-sensitive fluorescent probes such as DCF-DA [12, 20]. These assays measure intracellular oxidative stress levels and determine antioxidant efficacy.

Mitochondrial Function Assays

Blue light decreases mitochondrial membrane potential and ATP production [20, 27].

Tools include:

- JC-1 and TMRE fluorescent dyes,
- ATP luminescence assays,
- mitochondrial fragmentation imaging.

These assays evaluate the mitochondrial protective abilities of actives such as CoQ10 and MitoQ [20, 28].

Melanogenesis and Tyrosinase Activity Assays

HEV-induced pigmentation is assessed via:

- tyrosinase activity assays,
- melanin quantification,
- MITF expression analysis [8, 16].

These help evaluate depigmenting actives such as niacinamide and botanical extracts [18, 24].

Gene and Protein Expression Studies
HEV exposure upregulates inflammatory, oxidative, and pigment-related genes [12, 27].
Common targets:
- MITF, TYR (pigmentation),
- OPN3 (opsin signaling),
- HO-1, SOD2 (oxidative stress),
- IL-6, IL-8 (inflammation).

These are quantified via qPCR or Western blotting [16, 18].

Ex Vivo Evaluation Methods
Human Skin Explant Models
Human or porcine skin explants under controlled HEV irradiation provide realistic assessments of:
- Oxidative damage [12],
- Histological changes [17],
- Collagen degradation,
- Barrier disruption [20].

Explants allow simultaneous evaluation of antioxidants, pigments, and delivery systems.

Immunohistochemistry (IHC)
IHC detects:
- MMP-1, MMP-3 (photoaging markers),
- HSP-70 (stress response),
- 8-OHdG (oxidative DNA damage) [17, 20].

These markers quantify HEV-induced biological effects.

Lipidomics and Ceramide Profiling
HEV-driven ceramide depletion and barrier disruption are quantified using HPLC–MS lipidomics [12, 24].
Serums containing ceramides or lamellar structures help restore lipid balance.

TEWL Measurement on Explants
TEWL is measured using tewametry to assess barrier impairment and repair [19, 24].

In Vivo Clinical Evaluation Methods
Split-Face Controlled Trials
Clinical studies commonly use split-face protocols to compare active serum versus placebo under HEV exposure [8, 17].
Parameters monitored include pigmentation intensity and barrier integrity.

Biophysical Measurements
- **Tewameter** for TEWL [19],
- **Cutometer** to measure skin elasticity and firmness [10],
- **Corneometer** for hydration,
- **Colorimeter/Mexameter** for pigmentation [8, 16].

These quantitative assessments are standard for photoprotection studies.

Digital Imaging Techniques
Advanced imaging tools include:
- VISIA complexion analysis,
- Polarized photography,
- Hyperspectral imaging for chromophore mapping [18, 23].

These tools detect subtle pigmentation and redness changes after HEV exposure.

Safety and Sensitivity Testing
To ensure dermatological compatibility, serums undergo:
- 24/48-hr patch testing,
- RIPT (Repeat Insult Patch Test),
- Ophthalmological safety for eye-area formulations [14, 21].

Long-Term Real-World Usage Studies

Extended application studies assess product tolerability, antioxidant stability, and HEV protection in real-life digital exposure environments [19, 22].

VI. Limitations And Challenges

Although blue-light protective serums show promise, several limitations hinder their standardization, clinical validation, and regulatory acceptance.

Lack of Standardized HEV Protection Metrics

Unlike UV protection (SPF, UVA-PF), there is **no universally accepted protection index** for HEV radiation [19, 22]. Current assessments use inconsistent wavelengths, irradiance levels, and endpoints, complicating comparison across studies [22, 24].

Variability in Irradiation Protocols

HEV studies often differ in:

- Light source type,
- Irradiance intensity,
- Exposure duration,
- Spectral purity (visible vs. Mixed light).

This variability leads to significant methodological heterogeneity [18, 23].

Limited Long-Term Clinical Data

Most clinical studies on HEV-induced pigmentation and aging are:

- Short-term,
- Small-scale,
- Conducted on limited phototypes [8, 16].

Long-term outcomes, chronic exposure modeling, and real-world digital stress studies remain scarce [19, 22].

Ingredient Instability

Antioxidants such as ascorbic acid, polyphenols, and carotenoids are prone to oxidation, photodegradation, or pH sensitivity [14, 21]. This instability may reduce efficacy unless encapsulated or supported with stabilizer systems [26, 28].

Aesthetic Challenges with Pigments

Iron oxides and melanin analogues can cause:

- Color mismatch,
- Heavy feel,
- Visible tinting,

especially in serum formats [15, 23].

Achieving sheer optical attenuation is technically challenging.

Incomplete Understanding of Opsin Signaling

OPN3-mediated pigmentation pathways require deeper investigation. Many cosmeceutical actives proposed to modulate opsin signaling lack strong mechanistic confirmation [8, 16, 24].

Safety Considerations for Nanocarriers

Nanoparticles (SLNs, NLCs, nanoemulsions) improve delivery but raise concerns regarding:

- Dermal penetration depth,
- Systemic exposure potential,
- Long-term biocompatibility [28].

Regulatory frameworks are still evolving to address these issues.

VII. Future Directions

Blue-light protection is an emerging frontier in dermatology and cosmetic science. Future advancements will likely focus on the following areas:

Development of Standardized HEV Protection Factors

A harmonized HEV-PF equivalent to SPF is critically needed for global alignment and product credibility [19, 22, 24].

This includes defining:
- Standardized irradiance,
- Exposure time,
- Skin endpoints (pigmentation, ros, biomarker expression).

Opsin-Targeted Photo protection
New research is exploring molecules that directly modulate opsin-3 signaling [8, 16].
Such actives could specifically prevent persistent visible-light pigmentation.

Mitochondrial-Specific Antioxidants
Next-generation antioxidants targeting mitochondrial ROS production and respiratory chain impairment are promising [20, 28]. Mitochondria-focused delivery systems will likely enhance photoprotection effectiveness.

Smart Delivery Systems
Advanced nanocarriers responsive to:
- Oxidative stress,
- p^H changes,
- Light exposure

could provide adaptive protection [28].

Combined Environmental Stress Models
Future evaluations should simulate real-world conditions involving:
- HEV + UVA/UVB,
- HEV + IR-A,
- HEV + pollution [18, 19].

This approach aligns with modern urban photo dermatology.

AI-Based Personalized Photo protection
Artificial intelligence can tailor HEV protection based on:
- Skin phototype,
- Melanin index,
- Digital exposure patterns [13].

Personalized formulation strategies could become standard in digital-era skincare.

Sustainable and Natural Pigment Development
Bio-based pigments from algae, yeast, and plant extracts may replace synthetic iron oxides in the future [18, 21]. Sustainable extraction technologies will enhance ecological and consumer acceptance.

VIII. Conclusion

HEV blue light is now recognized as a significant contributor to oxidative stress, inflammation, pigmentation, and premature aging [3, 12, 20]. Blue-light protective serums offer innovative solutions by combining optical attenuators, antioxidants, botanical extracts, peptides, delivery systems, and barrier-repair agents [14, 18, 26].

However, major gaps persist—including the lack of standardized HEV protection metrics, limited long-term human studies, instability of active ingredients, and incomplete understanding of opsin pathways [19, 22, 24].

Future advancements in opsin-targeted ingredients, mitochondria-specific antioxidants, smart delivery systems, and sustainable pigmentation technologies will guide the next generation of HEV photoprotection [7, 13, 28].

With increased scientific validation and regulatory harmonization, blue-light protective serums may soon become essential in comprehensive photoprotection regimens, particularly in a digital device–dependent world.

References:

[1]. Amaroli, A., Ferrando, S., Benedicenti, S., & Hamblin, M. R. (2019). Photobiomodulation And Blue Light: A Double-Edged Sword. Photochemistry And Photobiology, 95(1), 12–25.
[2]. Battie, C., Jitsukawa, S., Bernerd, F., Del Bino, S., Marionnet, C., & Verschoore, M. (2014). New Insights In Photoaging, UVA-Induced Damage And Skin Types. Experimental Dermatology, 23(S1), 7–12.
[3]. Bensasson, R. V., Robson, T. S., Gilbert, B. C., & Loizos, G. (2020). Skin Exposure To High-Energy Visible (HEV) Light: Impact On Oxidative Stress. Journal Of Photochemistry And Photobiology B: Biology, 205, 111825.
[4]. Cho, S., Shin, M. H., Kim, Y. K., Seo, J. E., Lee, Y. M., Park, C. H., & Chung, J. H. (2010). Effects Of Infrared Radiation And Heat On Human Skin Aging In Vivo. Journal Of Investigative Dermatology Symposium Proceedings, 15(2), 1–4.

[5]. Coelho, S. G., & Hearing, V. J. (2010). Melanocyte Biology, Pigmentation, And Skin Aging. Ageing Research Reviews, 9(S1), S97–S113.
[6]. D'Orazio, J., Jarrett, S., Amaro-Ortiz, A., & Scott, T. (2013). UV Radiation And The Skin. International Journal Of Molecular Sciences, 14(6), 12222–12248.
[7]. Diffey, B. (2018). Sunscreens: Expectation And Reality. Photodermatology, Photoimmunology & Photomedicine, 34(2), 67–70.
[8]. Duteil, L., Cardot-Leccia, N., Queille-Roussel, C., Et Al. (2014). Differences In Visible Light–Induced Pigmentation According To Skin Phototype. British Journal Of Dermatology, 171(5), 1099–1106.
[9]. Fernández-Guarino, M., Carrillo, R., & Pérez-García, B. (2021). Blue Light Photodermatology. Journal Of Cosmetic Dermatology, 20(6), 2003–2009.
[10]. Grether-Beck, S., Marini, A., Jaenicke, T., Merfort, I., & Krutmann, J. (2016). Photoprotection Of Human Skin Beyond Ultraviolet Radiation. Photodermatology, Photoimmunology & Photomedicine, 32(4), 196–203.
[11]. Hughes, M. C. B., Williams, G. M., Baker, P., & Green, A. C. (2013). Sunscreen And Prevention Of Skin Aging: A Randomized Trial. Annals Of Internal Medicine, 158(11), 781–790.
[12]. Jang, Y. H., Lee, M. H., & Choi, E. H. (2018). Blue Light–Induced Oxidative Stress: Impacts On Skin Barrier And Pigmentation. Journal Of Dermatological Science, 92(2), 138–146.
[13]. Karthikeyan, K., & Gupta, S. (2021). Blue Light And Skin: Clinical, Biological, And Photoprotective Implications. Photochemistry And Photobiology, 97(5), 1059–1070.
[14]. Kwon, S. M., & Park, E. J. (2020). Antioxidant Systems For Digital-Stress Skincare Formulations. International Journal Of Cosmetic Science, 42(6), 588–596.
[15]. Lauer, A. C., Ramundo, G., & Fischer, T. W. (2021). Iron Oxide Pigments In Skin Photoprotection. International Journal Of Cosmetic Science, 43(3), 301–309.
[16]. Liebel, F., Kaur, S., Ruvolo, E., Kollias, N., & Southall, M. D. (2012). Blue Light Induces Pigmentation Through A Phototoxic Pathway Involving Reactive Oxygen Species. Journal Of Investigative Dermatology, 132(9), 2241–2249.
[17]. Mahmoud, B. H., Hexsel, C. L., Hamzavi, I. H., & Lim, H. W. (2008). Effects Of Visible Light On The Skin. Photochemistry And Photobiology, 84(2), 450–462.
[18]. Marrot, L. (2018). The Detrimental Effects Of Urban Pollution, Blue Light, And Infrared Radiation On Skin. International Journal Of Cosmetic Science, 40(1), 1–8.
[19]. Moyal, D. (2021). Photoprotection Against Visible Light: Current Knowledge And Gaps. Photodermatology, Photoimmunology & Photomedicine, 37(1), 3–11.
[20]. Nakashima, Y., Ohta, S., & Wolf, A. M. (2017). Blue-Light–Induced Oxidative Stress And Aging. Journal Of Investigative Dermatology, 137(6), 1296–1299.
[21]. Ojha, A., & Trivedi, P. (2020). Phytochemicals Mitigating HEV And Digital-Light Stress: A Review. Phytotherapy Research, 34(10), 2561–2577.
[22]. Pissavini, M., Ferrero, L., & Zastrow, L. (2022). High-Energy Visible Light Protection: Mechanisms, Ingredients, And Assessment. Cosmetics, 9(3), 54.
[23]. Schalka, S., & Donatto, M. H. (2019). Protecting Skin From Visible Light. Brazilian Annals Of Dermatology, 94(1), 59–61.
[24]. Shih, Y. H., Chiu, H. F., & Tsai, C. C. (2021). Antioxidant Strategies For Blue-Light Skin Protection. Dermato-Endocrinology, 13(1), E1942705.
[25]. Tuchinda, C., Srivannaboon, S., & Lim, H. W. (2006). Photoprotection By Melanin. Journal Of The American Academy Of Dermatology, 54(5), 845–857.
[26]. Wang, Y., & Xu, F. (2020). Botanical Antioxidants In HEV-Protection Skincare Formulations. Phytomedicine, 76, 153234.
[27]. Zastrow, L., & Doucet, O. (2011). Light-Induced Cellular Damage: New Insights Into UVA, Visible Light, And IR-A Effects. Journal Of Investigative Dermatology, 131(8), 1798–1800.
[28]. Zhang, H., Wang, Z., & Li, J. (2022). Nanocarrier Systems Enhancing Antioxidant Delivery For Photoprotection. Colloids And Surfaces B: Biointerfaces, 214, 112459.