International Journal of Current Research and Techniques (IJCRT)
E-ISSN: 2349-3194 (Online) | P-ISSN: 2348-4446 (Print)
UGC Approved Journal No: 47722 [No: 2616]
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.15289331

Unmasking the Sun: A Critical Review of Synthetic UV Filters and Their Hidden Impacts on Human and Environmental Health

Kusume Sireesha, *Assist. Prof, Bharat Institutions-Pharmacy, JNTUH Mangalpalle, Ibrahimpatnam, Hyderabad, 501510.*

J. Ramesh, *Student, Bharat Institutions-Pharmacy, JNTUH Mangalpalle, Ibrahimpatnam, Hyderabad, 501510.*

G. Sai Krishna, *Student, Bharat Institutions-Pharmacy, JNTUH Mangalpalle, Ibrahimpatnam, Hyderabad, 501510.*

J. Kalpana, *Student, Bharat Institutions-Pharmacy, JNTUH Mangalpalle, Ibrahimpatnam, Hyderabad, 501510.*

H. Kumar, *Student, Bharat Institutions-Pharmacy, JNTUH Mangalpalle, Ibrahimpatnam, Hyderabad, 501510.*

Manuscript Received: Apr 24, 2025; Revised: Apr 27, 2025; Published: Apr 27, 2025

Abstract: The widespread use of synthetic ultraviolet (UV) filters in sunscreen formulations has long been accepted as a primary strategy for skin cancer prevention and protection against photoaging. However, growing scientific evidence has revealed significant concerns related to their safety and environmental sustainability. This review highlights the health risks, environmental impacts, formulation challenges, and regulatory issues associated with commonly used synthetic UV filters. It also discusses the urgent need for safer, more sustainable alternatives, such as mineral-based and herbal UV protectants. By critically examining recent literature, this paper aims to raise awareness and promote a more balanced and responsible approach to sun protection.

Keywords: Synthetic UV Filters, Herbal UV protectants, Mineral-based UV filters, Sunscreens.

1. Introduction

Synthetic sunscreens are chemical agents designed to absorb, reflect, or scatter UV radiation, primarily in the UVA (320–400 nm) and UVB (290–320 nm) ranges. Their widespread application in personal care products is driven by their lightweight texture and photoprotective efficiency. Despite their efficacy, these compounds are increasingly scrutinized for their potential systemic toxicity, hormonal activity, photoinstability, and ecotoxicological effects. This review explores these multifaceted drawbacks in detail.

2. Health Hazards Associated with Synthetic UV Filters

2.1. Skin Irritation and Allergic Reactions

Several synthetic filters are associated with contact dermatitis and skin hypersensitivity. PABA, Oxybenzone, and Avobenzone are known to cause:

- Redness
- Itching
- Inflammatory reactions, especially in individuals with sensitive or broken skin

2.2. Endocrine Disruption

Synthetic UV filters such as **Oxybenzone**, **Octinoxate**, and **Homosalate** have demonstrated **estrogenic and anti-androgenic activity** in both in-vitro and in-vivo studies. Documented effects include:

- Disruption of reproductive hormones
- Reduced sperm count
- Thyroid dysfunction
- Developmental toxicity in children and fetuses

International Journal of Current Research and Techniques (IJCRT)
E-ISSN: 2349-3194 (Online) | P-ISSN: 2348-4446 (Print)
UGC Approved Journal No: 47722 [No: 2616]
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.15289331

2.3. Systemic Absorption and Bioaccumulation

Recent studies have found measurable concentrations of synthetic filters in:

- **Urine**
- **Blood plasma**
- **Breast milk** This indicates **percutaneous absorption** and potential **bioaccumulation**, raising concerns about long-term systemic toxicity.

3. Environmental Concerns

3.1. Aquatic Toxicity and Coral Bleaching

Filters like **Oxybenzone** and **Octinoxate** are toxic to marine ecosystems. Their impact includes:

- Coral bleaching and DNA damage in coral larvae
- Endocrine disruption in fish and sea urchins
- Bioaccumulation in aquatic organisms

These issues have led to **regional bans**, including:

- Hawaii (USA)
- Palau
- Key West (Florida)

3.2. Persistence and Bioaccumulation in Water Systems

Synthetic filters are **poorly biodegradable** and resistant to wastewater treatment. This leads to:

- Presence in lakes, rivers, and oceans
- Potential trophic transfer through aquatic food chains

4. Photoinstability and Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) Generation

Many synthetic UV filters degrade upon UV exposure, producing **free radicals and ROS**, which can:

- Penetrate the skin
- Damage cellular structures and DNA
- Promote photoaging and inflammation

Examples include:

- **Avobenzone**, which rapidly degrades unless stabilized
- **Octocrylene**, which may produce benzophenone as a degradation product

5. Formulation and Compatibility Challenges

- Synthetic filters often require **stabilizers, solubilizers, and preservatives**, increasing formulation complexity.
- **Incompatibility with other ingredients** (e.g., Avobenzone with Octinoxate) may lead to reduced efficacy or breakdown.

- Formulation stability, skin penetration, and broad-spectrum protection are difficult to balance without significant trade-offs.

6. Regulatory Landscape and Public Perception

- Growing regulatory scrutiny from **FDA (USA)**, **EMA (Europe)**, and **Cosmetic Regulation Boards** globally.
- Bans and labelling requirements have emerged for certain filters.
- Rising consumer demand for **"reef-safe," "natural," and "organic"** sunscreens is shifting market trends.
- Public mistrust of long chemical names and potential toxicity is influencing formulation strategies.

7. Toward Safer Alternatives

7.1. Mineral UV Filters

- **Zinc oxide** and **Titanium dioxide** offer broad-spectrum protection, are inert, and less irritating.
- Recent innovations include **non-nano formulations** to address concerns about nanoparticle toxicity.

7.2. Herbal and Plant-Based Filters

- Extracts from **raspberry seed**, **green tea**, **carrot seed**, **turmeric**, and **aloe vera** show promising SPF potential and antioxidant benefits.
- These offer **multifunctional skin benefits** and are generally considered **safe and biodegradable**.

8. Conclusion

While synthetic UV filters have played a vital role in modern sun protection, their **health risks, environmental damage, and formulation challenges** demand a more sustainable approach. A shift toward **mineral and plant-based alternatives**, coupled with **clean label practices** and **regulatory innovation**, is essential for ensuring safe and effective photoprotection in the future.

9. References:

[1] Matta, M. K., Zusterzeel, R., Pilli, N. R., Patel, V., Volpe, D. A., Florian, J., Oh, L., & Bashaw, E. D. (2019). Effect of sunscreen application on plasma concentration of sunscreen active ingredients: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA, 321(21), 2082-2091. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2019.5586

[2] Giokas, D. L., Salvador, A., & Chisvert, A. (2007). UV filters: From sunscreens to human body and the environment. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 26(5), 360–374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2007.02.012

[3] Balmer, M. E., Buser, H. R., Müller, M. D., & Poiger, T. (2005). Occurrence of some organic UV filters in wastewater, in surface waters, and in fish from Swiss lakes. Environmental Science & Technology, 39(4), 953–962. https://doi.org/10.1021/es040055r

[4] Siller, A., Blaszak, S. C., Lazar, M., & Olasz Harken, E. (2018). Update about the effects of the sunscreen ingredients oxybenzone and octinoxate on humans and the environment. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery Global Open, 6(8), e2213. https://doi.org/10.1097/GOX.0000000000002213

[5] Krause, M., Klit, A., Blomberg Jensen, M., Søeborg, T., Frederiksen, H., Schlumpf, M., Lichtensteiger, W., Kortenkamp, A., & Skakkebaek, N. E. (2012). Sunscreens: are they beneficial for health? An overview of endocrine disrupting properties of UV-filters. International Journal of Andrology, 35(3), 424–436. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2605.2012.01280.x

[6] Downs, C. A., Kramarsky-Winter, E., Segal, R., Fauth, J. E., Knutson, S., Bronstein, O., Ciner, F. R., Jeger, R., Lichtenfeld, Y., Woodley, C. M., Pennington, P., Cacciapaglia, R., & Kushmaro, A. (2016). Toxicopathological effects of the sunscreen UV filter, oxybenzone (benzophenone-3), on coral planulae and cultured primary cells and its environmental contamination in Hawaii and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, 70(2), 265–288. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-015-0227-7

[7] Schlumpf, M., Durrer, S., Faass, O., Ehnes, C., Fuetsch, M., Gaille, C., Henseler, M., Hofkamp, I., Maerkel, K., Reolon, E., Timms, B., Weise, K., Zahner, M., & Lichtensteiger, W. (2004). Developmental toxicity of UV filters

and environmental relevance: a review. International Journal of Andrology, 27(6), 263–269. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2605.2004.00581.x

[8] FDA. (2020). Sunscreen Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use; Proposed Rule. U.S. Food & Drug Administration. https://www.fda.gov/media/124655/download

[9] European Commission. (2022). Cosmetic Ingredient Database (CosIng) – UV filters and safety information. https://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/cosmetics/cosing/

[10] Waldman, R. A., & Grant-Kels, J. M. (2019). The role of sunscreen in the prevention of cutaneous melanoma and nonmelanoma skin cancer. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology, 80(3), 574–576. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2018.10.062

[11] Danovaro, R., Bongiorni, L., Corinaldesi, C., Giovannelli, D., Damiani, E., Astolfi, P., Gombault, E., Vacelet, J., Cerrano, C., & Pusceddu, A. (2008). Sunscreens cause coral bleaching by promoting viral infections. Environmental Health Perspectives, 116(4), 441–447. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.10966