SZEREJ, Krzysztof, KOT, Alicja, WOJTCZAK, Marta, MYŚLIWIEC, Natalia, RÓŻYCKI, Adrian, PNIAK, Michał, MIKLIS, Paweł, MAWLICHANÓW, Maciej, CIESIELSKA, Aleksandra and SIERADZKA, Aleksandra. Unveiling the Hidden Dangers: The Impact of Blue Light on Skin Health and Aging. Quality in Sport. 2024;30:56775. eISSN 2450-3118.
https://doi.org/10.12775/QS.2024.30.56775
https://apcz.umk.pl/QS/article/view/56775

The journal has been 20 points in the Ministry of Higher Education and Science of Poland parametric evaluation. Annex to the announcement of the Minister of Higher Education and Science of 05.01.2024. No. 32553.
Has a Journal's Unique Identifier: 201398. Scientific disciplines assigned: Economics and finance (Field of social sciences); Management and Quality Sciences (Field of social sciences).
Punkty Ministerialne z 2019 - aktualny rok 20 punktów. Załącznik do komunikatu Ministra Szkolnictwa Wyższego i Nauki z dnia 05.01.2024 r. Lp. 32553. Posiada Unikatowy Identyfikator Czasopisma: 201398.
Przypisane dyscypliny naukowe: Ekonomia i finanse (Dziedzina nauk społecznych); Nauki o zarządzaniu i jakości (Dziedzina nauk społecznych).

Received: 08.12.2024. Revised: 28.12.2024. Accepted: 30.12.2024. Published: 30.12.2024.

Unveiling the Hidden Dangers: The Impact of Blue Light on Skin Health and Aging

Authors:
[1]Krzysztof Szerej
District Hospital in Sochaczew, Batalionów Chłopskich 3/7, Sochaczew, Poland,
https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7581-4965
krzychszerej@gmail.com
[2]Alicja Kot
Medical University of Warsaw
https://orcid.org/0009-0001-2999-6775
alicja.kot28@gmail.com
[3]Marta Wojtczak
County Health Center in Otwock Sp. z o.o. Otwock, Poland
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0032-7520
martaw.1998@gmail.com
[4] Natalia Myśliwiec
National Medical Institute of the Ministry of the Interior and Administration, Warsaw, Poland
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4359-9899
nataliamysliwiec45@gmail.com
[5] Adrian Różycki
Medica Plus Family Clinic Sp. z o. o., Gdańsk, Poland
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9110-5443
adrian.rozycki@gmail.com
[6] Michał Pniak
John Paul II Memorial Masovia Provincial Hospital in Siedlce, Poland
https://orcid.org/0009-0006-2982-6078

---

[1] krzychszerej@gmail.com

[2] alicja.kot28@gmail.com

[3] martaw.1998@gmail.com

[4] nataliamysliwiec45@gmail.com

[5] adrian.rozycki@gmail.com

[6] michal.pniak@tlen.pl

michal.pniak@tlen.pl
[7] Paweł Miklis
University Clinical Center of the Medical University of Warsaw, Poland
https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4578-233X
pawelmiklis3@wp.pl
[8] Maciej Mawlichanów
Military Institute of Medicine, Warsaw Poland
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6543-8105
mmawlichanow@gmail.com
[9] Aleksandra Ciesielska
Mazovian Rehabilitation Center "STOCER" Sp. z o.o. Railway Hospital in Pruszków: Pruszków, PL
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5015-6140
aleksandra.ciesielska99@gmail.com
[10] Aleksandra Sieradzka
Medical University of Warsaw
https://orcid.org/0009-0004-2281-7617
aleksandra.w.sieradzka@wp.pl

Abstract

Introduction: Deeper into the skin than UV radiation, blue light (400–490 nm) a component of the visible spectrum induces oxidative stress, DNA damage, and early aging. Its long-term effects on skin health remain understudied given growing exposure from digital devices.

The aim of this study: The objective of the review is to investigate how blue light affects skin by means of UV radiation comparison, vulnerability identification, and evaluation of mitigating techniques including sunscreens, antioxidants, and behavioral modification.

The materials and methods used: Synthesized were data from in vitro, in vivo, and clinical studies using materials and techniques. Advanced imaging, spectrophotometry, and biopsies under controlled blue light exposure allowed one to quantify cellular and molecular damage including ROS generation and collagen degradation.

Conclusion: In essence, blue light fuels oxidative stress, pigment problems, and skin aging. Among the effective mitigating techniques are lifestyle changes, advanced photoprotection, and antioxidant-rich skincare. Future studies will help to solve chronic exposure issues and enhance protective strategies.

Key words: blue light exposure, skin damage, skin health, antioxidants

Introduction

Growing concern is related to the consequences of blue light on human health, particularly skin condition. Often referred to as high-energy visible (HEV) light, blue light is a subset of the visible light spectrum distinguished from UV radiation by some properties. Given the negative consequences of UV radiation on the skin, studies on

---

[7] pawelmiklis3@wp.pl

[8] mmawlichanow@gmail.com

[9] aleksandra.ciesielska99@gmail.com

[10] aleksandra.w.sieradzka@wp.pl

the harmful effects of blue light exposure are nevertheless rather relevant even if they are rather new. With an eye toward the skin, this essay examines the biological processes, effects, and likely risks of blue light exposure. Within the range of visible light, blue light has wavelengths between 400 and 490 nm [1]. It is produced naturally in sunshine [2] as well as artificially by LED and fluorescent lights as well as by digital gadgets such computers, phones, and tablets. The great usage of artificial sources in modern life has greatly increased daily blue light exposure, which generates questions regarding probable dermatological effects [3].

Mostly influencing the epidermis, blue light penetrates the skin deeper than UV light. It reaches the dermis and interacts with important elements of life, keratinocytes, melanocytes, and fibroblasts [4]. These interactions could lead to oxidative stress, DNA damage, and cellular malfunction. Because of its strong penetrating power, blue light gravely jeopardizes the long-term health of the skin. Given its increasing frequency—especially from digital devices and energy-efficient lighting—a thorough grasp of the consequences of artificial blue light exposure is quite crucial. Studies indicate that blue light could cause oxidative stress and inflammation in skin cells, hence exacerbating pigment issues and early aging [1, 5]. Blue light mostly produces reactive oxygen species (ROS), which indirectly compromise cellular integrity unlike UV radiation, which directly causes DNA alterations [6].

Furthermore, even while blue light is typical in many contemporary settings, nothing is known about the general consequences of prolonged interaction to it. Research indicate that blue light may worsen hyperpigmentation and interfere with collagen formation, thereby leading to laxity and early skin aging [7]. Developing good preventive plans requires understanding of these systems.

Research still leaves numerous gaps even if numbers show the expected negative effects of blue light. One disadvantage of current studies is determining the long-term effects of persistent exposure and the role played by individual vulnerability, like genetic predisposition or pre-existing skin disorders [8]. Moreover lacking are thorough research contrasting the effects of UV and blue light, which would help to put their distinct hazards in perspective.

This summary seeks to:

1. Describe the biological and molecular processes behind blue light impacts on skin.

two.

2. Compare their effects to help one better grasp the differences between blue light and UV radiation.
3. Determine which groups experience the most effects from blue light.
4. Look at creative preventative solutions like skincare products with antioxidants, blue light filtering formulas, and lifestyle changes.

Closing these gaps will help to create successful protective policies applicable for public and healthcare provider knowledge [9]. As new product development improves and dermatological therapies are developed, research in this area could have a major influence.

Mechanisms of Blue Light Interaction with Skin

As worries over blue light's impacts develop, more research is being done on the processes by which it interacts with skin. Blue light interacts with skin at both the cellular and molecular levels unlike ultraviolet (UV) radiation, which is known to cause DNA damage and cancer. It is a topic of great interest in dermatological research since it may oxidatively stress the skin, penetrate deeper into its layers, and help to explain changes associated to aging. While it is rather less penetrating than UVA (320–400 nm), blue light, with a 400– 490 nm wavelength range, more profoundly enters the skin than UVB (290–320 nm). Research point to blue light possibly reaching the dermal layer of the skin, which consists of essential structural elements such collagen and elastin [1]. Crucially for preserving the suppleness and integrity of skin, blue light irradiation (Opländer et al., 2011) has been shown to influence dermal fibroblasts. While UV radiation predominantly harms the epidermis, blue light's penetration lets it interact with deeper skin layers like the dermis. This specific ability emphasizes how blue light could cause cellular alterations in keratinocytes and melanocytes in the epidermis and fibroblasts in the dermis [2, 3]. This higher penetration may assist to explain why structural changes in the dermis can lead blue light to be connected with oxidative stress and aging symptoms such wrinkles and sagging [4]. Blue light mostly damages reactive oxygen species (ROS) by production. Blue light causes the formation of ROS in skin cells, therefore fostering oxidative stress unlike UV radiation, which directly destroys DNA strands. Defective DNA repair processes, mitochondrial damage, and cellular malfunction result from this oxidative stress [7].

Higher ROS levels in keratinocytes under blue light could affect the skin's capacity for barrier integrity. Melanocytes suffer as well; they produce pigment and induce hyperpigmentation and uneven skin tone. Blue light affects melanocyte development and proliferation, hence increasing melanin synthesis in specific skin types, according to research by Liebmann et al. (2010).

Mostly, blue light damages the dermal fibroblasts. ROS generated inside these cells may limit the synthesis of extracellular matrix proteins, most especially collagen and elastin, therefore reducing mitochondrial activity [8]. Furthermore connected to increased synthesis of the matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs), which destroy collagen and other structural proteins, is extended blue light exposure [6]. These changes cause the skin to lose its elasticity and suppleness, therefore hastening aging. Skin aging can be better understood by blue light's capacity to set inflammatory pathways and degrade collagen and elastin. Major structural element of the dermis, collagen gives skin strength and suppleness. After stretching, elastin cooperatively with collagen helps skin regain its natural structure. Research indicates that blue light induces MMPs [8, 5] thereby accelerating the breakdown of both proteins. Another impact of blue light is aging induced by inflammation. Claims Nakashima et al. (2017), blue light boosts the synthesis of pro-inflammatory cytokines, which aggravates oxidative damage and produces skin sensitivity, redness, and irritation. This inflammatory reaction produces laxity and wrinkle development and affects skin's homeostasis.

Moreover, blue light causes oxidative stress that speeds up the buildup of advanced glycation end-products (AGEs), hence stiffening and lowering the activity of collagen fibers. Fine lines, wrinkles, and drooping skin are only a few of the obvious aging effects of interaction between inflammation, oxidative stress, and collagen breakdown [9,7].

Clinical Signs and Illnesses

Beyond only harming cells, blue light's effects on skin health could clearly show up as clinically important, obvious dermatological conditions. Among these include problems with color, early aging, change of the skin barrier, and perhaps cancer-related links. Knowing these clinical effects is essential as blue light exposure rising from the growing usage of digital devices. One theory holds that blue light aggravates conditions including melasma and hyperpigmentation. Blue light generates oxidative stress, unlike UV (UV) radiation, which directly damages DNA, which results in too much melanin synthesis by melanocytes. Particularly in darker-skinned individuals who are more likely to have pigment problems, blue light is a contributing factor to long-lasting pigment alterations in the skin, according to Francois-Newton et al. (2022).

Mostly affecting blue light-induced pigment diseases are genetic predispositions. For instance, Letsiou et al. (2024) noted how ethnic differences affect the photoprotective response of melanin; some societies show increased risk of pigmentary disorders [11]. These results underscore the need of specific preventive measures for groups at danger. Usually connected with UV exposure, blue light has also been associated with photoaging. Blue light affects elastin and collagen since it reaches the dermis deeper than UV radiation. Claims Nakashima et al. (2017 [7] long-term exposure promotes the degradation of these proteins, which creates wrinkles and decreased skin suppleness. Although UV radiation usually results in superficial skin damage, a comparative analysis by Suitthimeathegorn et al. (2022) shows that blue light's deeper penetration may create structural changes over time which over time could cause drooping skin and increased skin laxity. Because its visual effects are more clear with increased exposure, blue light exposure accelerates aging. Blue light could compromise the integrity of the epidermal barrier, a required protection against environmental attacks. Blue light causes oxidative stress, which accelerates trans-epidermal water loss and dries the epidermis therefore compromising its lipid matrix. Long-term interaction lowers the barrier, therefore increasing skin sensitivity and conditions including eczema, as Lim et al. (2022) [12] show. Moreover, blue light affects the microbiota, which is vitally crucial for the state of skin. Gross et al. (2023), claim that oxidative stress alters the microbial balance of the skin and raises its susceptibility to inflammatory skin disorders and infections. These results highlight how complexly blue light affects the epidermal barrier.

Though the data is weak, the likely link between blue light exposure and skin cancer is attracting more attention. Blue light causes oxidative stress that over time could cause DNA modifications unlike UV radiation, which immediately kills DNA. Parrado et al. (2019) assert that blue light's continuous creation of reactive oxygen species (ROS) could assist cancer in proliferating [14].

Study design

One needs in vitro investigations largely to understand the cellular and molecular mechanisms of damage caused by blue light. Researchers examine oxidative stress, DNA damage, and inflammation by different blue light doses using human skin cell lines including keratinocytes, melanocytes, and fibroblasts. Often investigated in these investigations are production of reactive oxygen species (ROS), mitochondrial malfunction, and lipid peroxidation. Studies have shown, for example, that blue light significantly raises keratinocyte ROS levels, therefore causing oxidative stress and mortality [15]. There are also plenty of in vitro tests of the preventive action of antioxidants and blue light-filtering substances. Blue light melanocytes exposed to antioxidants such niacinamide and vitamin C have seen reduced oxidative damage . In vivo experiments with animal models or human volunteers let one replicate more reasonable blue light exposure levels. Using often genetically engineered rats that mimic human skin responses, animal research examine dermal and epidermal effects over time. After exposure, one assesses traits including pigment alterations, collagen degradation, and epidermal thickness. Blue light, for example, has proven in animal experiments to increase matrix metalloproteinase (MMP), which may cause early aging and collagen degradation [16]. Linking laboratory results with clearly visible skin conditions calls for human clinical research. Blue light in controlled settings exposes volunteers with different skin types to evaluate changes in pigment, moisture content, and barrier integrity. Using sophisticated imaging technologies, some investigations look at pigment markers like tyrosinase activity and melanin concentration . Real-world scenarios demand correct blue light exposure modeling. Under controlled environments in light exposure rooms replicating either sunlight or device outputs, blue light wavelengths (400–490 nm) are separated. Usually, exposure times resemble those of daily life or those related to the job; spectral filtering techniques guarantee correct dosage distribution as assessed in irradiation (mW/cm2) and total energy (J/cm2 [17]. Studies comparing exposure to blue light at high intensities and ambient levels [18] show that higher concentrations of blue light, for example, aggravate oxidative stress and cellular damage. Blue light at different intensities can thus be included into exposure models to investigate dose-dependent effects. The dermatological impact of blue light requires advanced measuring instruments. Spectrophotometers provide information on melanin and hemoglobin levels following exposure . This method, spectrophotometry, measures light absorption in skin samples to assess oxidative stress indicators and pigment changes. Dermoscopy, confocal microscopy, and hyperspectral imaging help researchers see changes in skin texture, moisture, and pigment; using confocal microscopy high-resolution photographs of cellular structures changed by blue light are especially viable. Skin samples let one to evaluate microscopic historical alterations by means of immunohistochemistry, so enabling the identification of biomarkers for blue light-induced damage including MMPs, ROS, and cytokines. Intracellular ROS levels are measured with fluorescent probes including dichlorodihydrofluorescentin diacetate (DCFDA). These investigations reveal, in a dose-dependent manner, blue light exposure raises keratinocyte ROS [16]. Often assessments of transepidermal water loss (TEWL) and hydration levels assist one determine how blue light affects the integrity of the skin barrier. Research using TEWL meters show considerable water loss after exposure, suggesting collapse of the barrier [18].

Results and discussion

Research on the complex ways blue light affects skin abound. Important results include indications of oxidative stress generation, improved melanin synthesis, and a new method of damage apart from UV radiation. This section explores these results more deeply and emphasizes the preventative ability of antioxidants. One of the most consistent results from studies is that blue light significantly increases oxidative stress indicators in the skin. Claiming to harm DNA, proteins, and lipids in cells, blue light produces reactive oxygen species (ROS). This oxidative stress speeds up skin aging by means of interfering with normal cellular processes. Also quite important is the influence of blue light on melanocytes. Blue light has been shown to increase melanin synthesis, thereby triggering pigment problems including melasma and hyperpigmentation. Particularly in skin types IV to VI, blue light increases tyrosinase, a necessary enzyme employed in the creation of melanin [12]. Visible effects linger for weeks after exposure, so this impact is longer-lasting than changes in UV-induced pigmentations [19].Blue light mostly harms skin by oxidative stress. Mitochondrial malfunction and lipid peroxidation brought on by ROS production compromise cellular homeostasis. Blue light-exposed fibroblasts' (Coats et al., 2021) decrease in collagen synthesis and increase in breakdown driven by matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs).

One of the main areas of research has been on preventative action of antioxidants in lowering blue light damage. Studies have found that antioxidants aid to lower ROS effects by include polyphenols, vitamin C, and vitamin E. By use of formulations comprising antioxidants, Valacchi et al. (2022) [20] significantly reduced oxidative stress markers in skin exposed to blue light. Moreover proved to be shielding of mitochondrial integrity and preventing of cellular death are compounds high in antioxidants [21]. Although both UV and blue light cause oxidative stress, their respective processes and degree of damage they cause differ greatly. By way of cyclobutane parylidine dimers (CPDs), UV light directly damages DNA, thereby generating mutations and cancer development. Whereas ROS causes oxidative changes [18], blue light indirectly damages DNA. Besides, blue light affects the extracellular matrix and penetrates fibroblasts in the dermis more deeply than UVB radiation. Sadowska et al. (2021) claim that more evident effects on collagen and elastin resulting from this higher penetration help to explain wrinkles and skin laxity [19]. While blue light's carcinogenicity is under investigation, UV radiation is still more effective in producing skin tumors [22]. Skin protection has to be treated holistically considering the combined effects of UV and blue light exposure. Blue light is clearly important for photoaging and pigment issues, as Lim et al. (2022) underline; consequently, sunscreens should include blue light-specific filters [12].

Mitigation strategies

Effective mitigation techniques becoming ever more crucial as understanding of how blue light impacts skin health increases. These approaches, which address the complex character of blue light exposure, consist in preventive interventions, lifestyle changes, and developments in protective technologies. To incorporate blue light-blocking characteristics, modern sunscreen formulations sometimes call for physical blockers like zinc oxide and titanium dioxide. Furthermore shown is how quite effective filters such as iron oxides are in reducing the wavelengths of blue and visible light. In human volunteers, a 2022 Lim et al. analysis on sunscreens with filters omitting blue light indicated that they lowered oxidative damage and pigment [12]. Blue light's produced reactive oxygen species (ROS) are well recognized to be counteracted by antioxidants; hence, skincare products increasingly contain polyphenols, vitamin C, and vitamin E. Before blue light, topical antioxidants administered before drastically reduced oxidative stress markers. Another fascinating topic is the use of antioxidants derived from marine sources, particularly mycosporine-like amino acids, which have shown protective actions against damage generated by blue light [20]. Including blue light filters into appliances like computers, cellphones, and LED displays helps to lower exposure in one simple method. While keeping screen clarity, these filters reduce the high-energy visible light output. Bonnans et al. asserts blue light-filtering devices less eye weariness and skin oxidative stress in those who spend a lot of time in front of screens [23]. Advances in the circularly aligned lighting systems are starting to appeal more and more. These strategies reduce the evening blue light emission by changing the spectral mix of indoor lighting. This approach not only shields the skin but also helps the circadian cycle to be generally healthy. Furthermore improving personal security are fresh developments in wearable skin sensor technology. These gadgets detect overall exposure to hazardous wavelengths, therefore enabling users to react rapidly preventatively. Wearable technology may efficiently monitor daily blue light exposure and provide useful data for minimizing harm [13]. Reducing unnecessary screen time and completing digital detoxes has been reported to aid to minimize total exposure to high-energy visible light [24]. Reducing screen time—

especially in the evening—is an easy but effective method to cut blue light exposure. One such behavior is turning off evening blue light sources. Reducing evening blue light exposure increased skin healing and lessened oxidative damage, reports Verma et al. (2024 [25). Using circadian-aligned lighting helps to preserve general well-being and skin condition. Changing behavior to include wearing clothes that filters blue light and spending more time outside under suitable sun protection is also beneficial. Outdoor exercise may offset the negative effects of indoor blue light exposure when coupled with sunscreen and antioxidant use.

Future Directions and Challenges

Research on blue light is growing fast as people become more conscious of how it affects human skin and health. Still, many unresolved questions need more investigation on long-term effects, vulnerabilities unique to a given group, and consistent approaches of exposure assessment.

Research by Dimitrova et al. (2021) [26] underlines the need of knowing cumulative exposure over decades, especially for persons with considerable screen time resulting from employment or leisure activities. Notwithstanding major study on the topic, the long-term effects of acute blue light exposure remain unclear. Though the precise direction of such impacts is currently unknown, long-term exposure could raise oxidative stress and damage skin cells holistically. Population-specific susceptibilities to blue light vary in environmental exposure, skin type, and genetic pred inclination. Research including those conducted by Passeron et al. (2021) [27] reveal that those with darker skin tones are more likely to have pigment problems. Furthermore, those who already have disorders such as photosensitivity or melasma could be more affected and require specific preventive measures. If we want to create protective devices and medicinal treatments, future research has to include dermatology, photobiology, and materials science. Multidisciplinary approaches could help to narrow knowledge gaps on the complicated biological processes blue light produces. It is difficult to separate blue light exposure from other factors: Separating the effects of blue light from other behavioral and environmental factors including stress, food, and UV exposure presents one of the main difficulties in blue light research. Complex experimental designs and longitudinal methods could be able to address this problem. Research is complicated by the absence of accepted techniques for gauging blue light exposure. Bonnans et al. (2020) particularly with reference to exposure length and intensity [23] underlined research design differences. Global standards for exposure assessment are needed to address issues, much as established norms for UV radiation. Blue light exposure is influenced both naturally and artificially. Sunlight greatly boosts outside exposure; indoors, gadgets are mostly responsible. The 2023 [28] study by Craig et al. underlines the importance of research in separating these sources and evaluating their total effects on the skin.

Understanding the consequences of protracted exposure depends on ethical and pragmatic challenges that longitudinal research brings, absolutely necessary for which. Getting long-term funds, ensuring constant inspection, and registering many groups all pose demanding tasks. Still, these research are absolutely vital for proving definite connections between blue light exposure and skin disorders. Wearable technology tracking of total blue light exposure is one useful study and public awareness tool now available. Gross et al. (2023) [13] highlighted the need of compiling real-time exposure data on individuals sporting wearable skin sensors. Further investigation on antioxidants and blue light-blocking molecules could produce rather successful preventive medicines. Underlined by Valacchi et al. (2023) [20] the possibility of using fresh marine-derived chemicals into cosmetics. Regional research contrasting blue light exposure with its consequences across various climates and lifestyles could offer insightful new angles. Both natural and manmade blue light sources could have compounding effects for people in equatorial areas with increased sun exposure.

Conclusion

Because blue light is so common from sunlight and digital devices, its effects on skin health are growingly worrisome. Blue light reaches deeper into the dermis than UV radiation, creating reactive oxygen species (ROS) that aggravate oxidative stress, inflammation, and early aging.This light influences keratinocytes, melanocytes, and fibroblasts, so causing pigment problems, elastin breakdown, and collagen degradation. Blue light also compromises the skin barrier, which increases sensitivity and changes the microbiome, so raising vulnerability to infections.Reducing damage looks best with blue light-specific sunscreens, antioxidant-rich products, screen filters, and less screen time. More study is still required, though, to assess long-term consequences, population-specific hazards, and the overall influence of UV radiation plus blue light. Dealing with these issues calls for multidisciplinary study, consistent exposure measurement, and creative protective solutions to improve skin condition.

Disclosures: No disclosures

Financial support: No financial support was received.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Bibliography

1. Opländer, C., Hidding, S., Werners, F. B., Born, M., Pallua, N., & Suschek, C. V. (2011). Effects of blue light irradiation on human dermal fibroblasts. Journal of photochemistry and photobiology. B, Biology, 103(2), 118–125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphotobiol.2011.02.018

2. Kappes, U. P., Luo, D., Potter, M., Schulmeister, K., & Rünger, T. M. (2006). Short- and Long-Wave UV Light (UVB and UVA) Induce Similar Mutations in Human Skin Cells. Journal of Investigative Dermatology, 126(3), 667–675. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.jid.5700093

3 Liebmann, J., Born, M., & Kolb-Bachofen, V. (2010). Blue-light irradiation regulates proliferation and differentiation in human skin cells. The Journal of investigative dermatology, 130(1), 259–269. https://doi.org/10.1038/jid.2009.194

4 Coats, J. G., Maktabi, B., Abou-Dahech, M. S., & Baki, G. (2021). Blue Light Protection, Part I-Effects of blue light on the skin. Journal of cosmetic dermatology, 20(3), 714–717. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocd.13837

5 Suitthimeathegorn, O., Yang, C., Ma, Y., & Liu, W. (2022). Direct and Indirect Effects of Blue Light Exposure on Skin: A Review of Published Literature. Skin pharmacology and physiology, 35(6), 305–318. https://doi.org/10.1159/000526720

6 Shin D. W. (2020). Various biological effects of solar radiation on skin and their mechanisms: implications for phototherapy. Animal cells and systems, 24(4), 181–188. https://doi.org/10.1080/19768354.2020.1808528

7 Nakashima, Y., Ohta, S., & Wolf, A. M. (2017). Blue light-induced oxidative stress in live skin. Free radical biology & medicine, 108, 300–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.freeradbiomed.2017.03.010

8 Ceresnie, M. S., Patel, J., Lim, H. W., & Kohli, I. (2022). The cutaneous effects of blue light from electronic devices: a systematic review with health hazard identification. Photochemical and Photobiological Sciences, 22(8). https://doi.org/10.1007/s43630-022-00318-9

9 Uzunbajakava, N. E., Tobin, D. J., Botchkareva, N. V., Dierickx, C., Bjerring, P., & Town, G. (2022). Highlighting nuances of blue light phototherapy: Mechanisms and safety considerations. Journal of Biophotonics, 16(2). https://doi.org/10.1002/jbio.202200257

10 Francois-Newton, V., Kolanthan, V. L., Mandary, M. B., Philibert, E. G., Soobramaney, V., Petkar, G., Sokeechand, B. N., Hosenally, M., Cavagnino, A., Baraibar, M. A., & Ng, S. P. (2022). The protective effect of a novel sunscreen against blue light. International Journal of Cosmetic Science, 44(4), 464–476. https://doi.org/10.1111/ics.12794

11 Letsiou, S., Koldiri, E., Beloukas, A., Rallis, E., & Kefala, V. (2024). Deciphering the Effects of Different Types of Sunlight Radiation on Skin Function: A Review. Cosmetics, 11(3), 80. https://doi.org/10.3390/cosmetics11030080

12 Lim, H. W., Kohli, I., Ruvolo, E., Kolbe, L., & Hamzavi, I. H. (2021). Impact of visible light on skin health: The role of antioxidants and free radical quenchers in skin protection. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2021.12.024

13 Varga, R., & Gross, J. (2023). Oxidative Stress Status and Its Relationship to Skin Aging. Plastic and aesthetic nursing, 43(3), 141–148. https://doi.org/10.1097/PSN.0000000000000515

14 Parrado, C., Mercado-Saenz, S., Perez-Davo, A., Gilaberte, Y., Gonzalez, S., & Juarranz, A. (2019). Environmental Stressors on Skin Aging. Mechanistic Insights. Frontiers in Pharmacology, 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2019.0075915 Hiramoto, K., et al. "Induction of skin cancer by long-term blue light irradiation." Biomedicines (2023).

15 Zhu, S., Li, X., Wu, F., Cao, X., Gou, K., Wang, C., & Lin, C. (2022). Blue light induces skin apoptosis and degeneration through activation of the endoplasmic reticulum stress-autophagy apoptosis axis: Protective role of hydrogen sulfide. Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B: Biology, 229, 112426. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphotobiol.2022.112426

16 Feng, C., Chen, X., Yin, X., Jiang, Y., & Zhao, C. (2024). Matrix Metalloproteinases on Skin Photoaging. *Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology*. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocd.16558

17 Wang, L., Yu, X., Zhang, D., Wen, Y., Zhang, L., Xia, Y., Chen, J., Xie, C., Zhu, H., Tong, J., & Shen, Y. (2023). Long-term blue light exposure impairs mitochondrial dynamics in the retina in light-induced retinal degeneration in vivo and in vitro. 240, 112654–112654. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphotobiol.2023.112654

18 Schütz, R. (2021). Blue Light and the Skin. Current Problems in Dermatology, 55, 354–373. https://doi.org/10.1159/000517644

19 Sadowska, M., Narbutt, J., & Lesiak, A. (2021). Blue Light in Dermatology. Life, 11(7), 670. https://doi.org/10.3390/life11070670

20 Farris, P. K., & Valacchi, G. (2022). Ultraviolet Light Protection: Is It Really Enough? Antioxidants, 11(8), 1484. https://doi.org/10.3390/antiox11081484

21 Furukawa, J. Y., Martinez, R. M., Morocho-Jácome, A. L., Castillo-Gómez, T. S., Pereda-Contreras, V. J., Rosado, C., Velasco, M. V. R., & Baby, A. R. (2021). Skin impacts from exposure to ultraviolet, visible, infrared, and artificial lights – a review. Journal of Cosmetic and Laser Therapy, 23(1-2), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/14764172.2021.1950767

22 Godley, B. F., Shamsi, F. A., Liang, F. Q., Jarrett, S. G., Davies, S., & Boulton, M. (2005). Blue light induces mitochondrial DNA damage and free radical production in epithelial cells. The Journal of biological chemistry, 280(22), 21061–21066. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M502194200

23 Bonnans, M., Fouque, L., Pelletier, M., Chabert, R., Pinacolo, S., Restellini, L., & Cucumel, K. (2020). Blue light: Friend or foe ? Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B: Biology, 212, 112026. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphotobiol.2020.11202624. Kumari, J., et al. "Digital detox for reducing blue light impact." Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology (2023). Link

25 Verma, A. K., Singh, S., & Rizvi, S. I. (2023). Aging, circadian disruption and neurodegeneration: Interesting interplay. Experimental Gerontology, 172, 112076. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2022.112076

26 Dimitrova, A., Ingole, V., Basagaña, X., Ranzani, O., Milà, C., Ballester, J., & Tonne, C. (2021). Association between ambient temperature and heat waves with mortality in South Asia: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Environment International, 146, 106170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.106170

27 Passeron, T., Lim, H. W., Goh, C. L., Kang, H. Y., Ly, F., Morita, A., Ocampo Candiani, J., Puig, S., Schalka, S., Wei, L., Dréno, B., & Krutmann, J. (2021). Photoprotection according to skin phototype and dermatoses: practical recommendations from an expert panel. Journal of the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology : JEADV, 35(7), 1460–1469. https://doi.org/10.1111/jdv.17242

28. Craig, J. P., Alves, M., Wolffsohn, J. S., Downie, L. E., Efron, N., Galor, A., Pereira, Á., Jones, L., Markoulli, M., Stapleton, F., Starr, C., Amy Gallant Sullivan, Willcox, M., & Sullivan, D. A. (2023). TFOS lifestyle report executive summary: A lifestyle epidemic – Ocular surface disease. Ocular Surface, 30, 240–253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtos.2023.08.009