European Journal of Clinical Pharmacy

Print ISSN: 2385-409X **Online ISSN:** 3105-0409

Website: https://farmclin.es/

Original Researcher Article

A Comprehensive Review On The Photoprotective Potential Of Phytochemicals In Herbal Sunscreen Formulations

Article History:

Name of Author:

Vaishnavi S. Shejul[1], Dr. Meenakshi G. Chitte[2], Dr. Gopalkrushna R. Sitaphale[3], Dr. Prafulla R. Tathe[4]

Affiliation: *[1*]Student, Samarth College of Pharmacy, Deulgaon Raja, Buldana, Maharashtra, India.*

[2]Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Samarth College of Pharmacy, Deulgaon Raja, Buldana, Maharashtra, India.

[3]Professor, Samarth College of Pharmacy, Deulgaon Raja, Buldana, Maharashtra, India.

[4]Principal and Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Samarth College of Pharmacy, Deulgaon Raja, Buldana, Maharashtra, India.

Corresponding Author: Vaishnavi S. Shejul

Email: vaishnavishejul99@gmail.com

Received: 10/01/2026

Revised: 30/01/2026

Accepted: 17/02/2026

Published: 26/02/2026

Abstracts: Exposure to solar ultraviolet (UV) radiation is a primary environmental factor contributing to deleterious cutaneous effects, including photoaging, immunosuppression, and photo carcinogenesis. Conventional sunscreens, utilizing synthetic chemical and mineral filters, have been the mainstay of photoprotection, yet growing concerns regarding their systemic absorption, potential for endocrine disruption, and significant ecotoxicity, particularly towards marine ecosystems, have catalyzed the search for safer and more sustainable alternatives. This review provides a comprehensive analysis of the burgeoning field of herbal sunscreen formulations, which leverage the photoprotective properties of phytochemicals derived from medicinal plants. These botanical compounds offer a multifunctional approach to skin protection, acting not only as natural UV filters through the absorption of UV radiation but also by mitigating its downstream biological consequences via potent antioxidant and anti-inflammatory activities. Key phytochemical classes, including polyphenols, flavonoids, and carotenoids, found in plants such as Camellia sinensis (green tea) and Aloe barbadensis (aloe vera), are examined for their mechanisms of action at the molecular level. While the evidence for their efficacy is promising, significant challenges remain, particularly concerning formulation stability, photostability, standardization of extracts, and the need for robust evaluation protocols that bridge the gap between in vitro screening and in vivo validation. The future of photoprotection likely resides in the development of synergistic, hybrid formulations that combine the reliability of mineral filters with the broad-spectrum biological benefits of plant extracts. This necessitates continued rigorous scientific investigation and clinical validation to fully harness the potential of herbal compounds in modern dermatological science.

How to cite: Shejul V S, Chitte M G, Sitaphale G R, Tathe P R. A Comprehensive Review on The Photoprotective Potential of Phytochemicals in Herbal Sunscreen Formulations. *European Journal of Clinical Pharmacy, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2026, pp. 1921-1928.*

Keywords: Herbal sunscreen; Phytochemicals; Photoprotection; UV radiation; Drug delivery systems

1. INTRODUCTION

The Public Health Imperative of Photoprotection

Solar ultraviolet (UV) radiation is unequivocally recognized as the most prevalent and modifiable environmental carcinogen affecting human populations (D'Orazio et al., 2013). The incidence of skin cancers, including the highly aggressive malignant melanoma and the more common non-melanoma skin cancers (NMSCs) such as basal cell carcinoma (BCC) and squamous cell carcinoma (SCC), has been increasing dramatically for decades, representing a significant and growing public health burden (Lomas et al., 2012). In the United States alone, one in five individuals will develop skin cancer in their lifetime, and unprotected exposure to UV radiation is the single most preventable risk factor (American Cancer Society, 2024). This established link between UV exposure and cutaneous malignancy underscores the critical importance of effective photoprotective strategies.

Conventional Sunscreens as the First Line of Defense

For much of the past century, topical sunscreens have been the cornerstone of public health campaigns aimed at mitigating the harmful effects of sun exposure (Autier et al., 2007). The widespread adoption of these products, which contain active ingredients that absorb, scatter, or reflect UV photons, has been instrumental in preventing acute effects like sunburn (erythema) and is recommended by dermatological and health organizations worldwide to reduce the risk of certain skin cancers (D'Orazio et al., 2013).

Emerging Limitations and the Catalyst for Change

Despite their proven efficacy, the reliance on conventional sunscreen agents is being increasingly questioned due to a confluence of emerging scientific concerns. These limitations, which form the central impetus for this review, fall into two primary categories. First, there are human health concerns related to the systemic absorption of certain organic (chemical) UV filters and an ongoing scientific debate regarding their potential to act as endocrine disruptors (Autier et al., 2007). Second, and perhaps more definitively, is the profound environmental impact of these same chemical agents. The ecotoxicity of compounds like oxybenzone and octinoxate, particularly their role in the bleaching and degradation of fragile coral reef ecosystems, has been well-documented and has prompted legislative action in several regions (Downs et al., 2016).

The Rise of Herbal Alternatives

These limitations have fueled a paradigm shift in both consumer preference and scientific research, leading to a surge of interest in plant-based, or herbal, photoprotection (Korać & Khambholja, 2011). This movement is driven by more than a simple preference for "natural" ingredients; it reflects a deeper evolution in the philosophy of skin protection. The herbal approach is inherently multifunctional. Plant-derived compounds not only provide a degree of UV filtering but also deliver potent antioxidant and anti-inflammatory benefits, addressing the complex biological cascade of damage initiated by UV radiation (Saewan & Jimtaisong, 2015).

This holistic strategy aims not just to block the initial insult of UV photons but to neutralize the subsequent oxidative stress and quell the inflammatory responses, thereby protecting skin on multiple levels. This transition from a singular focus on UV blocking to a more comprehensive goal of maintaining skin homeostasis is being propelled by a powerful feedback loop. As public awareness of the potential risks of synthetic chemicals grows, it creates market demand for "clean" and "natural" alternatives. This demand, in turn, stimulates academic and industrial research, leading to an expansion of studies that scientifically validate the traditional use and efficacy of botanicals in skincare.

Scope and Aims of the Review

This review aims to synthesize and critically analyze the current state of knowledge regarding herbal sunscreen creams. It will begin by detailing the mechanisms of UV-induced skin damage and critiquing the limitations of conventional sunscreen agents. The core of the review will be a detailed exploration of the key phytochemicals and medicinal plants with demonstrated photoprotective properties, followed by an examination of the significant challenges in formulation, stability, efficacy evaluation, and regulation that must be overcome to translate this potential into safe and effective commercial products.

2. ULTRAVIOLET RADIATION AND ITS CUTANEOUS EFFECTS

The Solar Spectrum

Solar radiation that reaches the Earth's surface contains a small but biologically potent fraction of ultraviolet radiation, which is categorized into three bands based on wavelength: UVA (320-400 nm), UVB (280-320 nm), and UVC (100-280 nm) (Diffey, 2002). UVC radiation, possessing the shortest wavelength and highest energy, is the most damaging but is almost completely absorbed by the stratospheric ozone layer, making it a negligible risk from solar exposure, though it can be a hazard from artificial sources like germicidal lamps (Diffey, 2002). The UV radiation that penetrates the atmosphere is composed of approximately 95% UVA and 5% UVB (Diffey, 2002).

Depth of Penetration and Mechanisms of Damage

The biological effects of UVA and UVB radiation are dictated by their energy levels and their ability to penetrate the skin's layers.

- UVB Radiation: UVB rays have higher energy than UVA rays but are less penetrating, with their effects largely confined to the epidermis, the outermost layer of the skin . UVB is the primary cause of sunburn and is a potent direct mutagen. Its energy is directly absorbed by cellular DNA, leading to the formation of specific photoproducts, most notably cyclobutane pyrimidine dimers (CPDs) and 6-4 photoproducts. If not repaired by the cell's endogenous mechanisms, these lesions can lead to signature mutations in key genes, such as the p53 tumor suppressor, directly initiating the process of carcinogenesis (D'Orazio et al., 2013).
- UVA Radiation: In contrast, UVA radiation has a longer wavelength and lower energy, allowing it to penetrate more deeply into the skin, reaching the dermis where it can damage critical structural components like collagen and elastin (Wang et al., 2012). The primary mechanism of UVA damage is indirect. Instead of being directly absorbed by DNA, UVA photons are absorbed by endogenous chromophores within the skin, which triggers the generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS), such as singlet oxygen and hydroxyl radicals (Diffey, 2002). This surge in ROS creates a state of oxidative stress that inflicts widespread damage on cellular macromolecules, including DNA (leading to oxidative base damage), lipids (lipid peroxidation), and proteins . For clarity, UVA is often subdivided into UVA1 (340–400 nm) and UVA2 (320–340 nm), with UVA2 sharing some of the erythema-causing properties of UVB (Wang et al., 2012).

Clinical Manifestations of UV-Induced Damage

The damage inflicted by UV radiation manifests in a range of clinical outcomes, from acute reactions to chronic, irreversible changes.

- Acute Effects: The most familiar acute effect of overexposure, primarily to UVB, is sunburn or erythema—a painful inflammatory response characterized by redness and swelling (Lomas et al., 2012). UV exposure also stimulates melanocytes to produce melanin, resulting in tanning, which is the skin's adaptive attempt to create a protective barrier against further UV insults (Brenner & Hearing, 2008). Furthermore, overexposure to UV can suppress the skin's immune system, impairing its ability to mount a defense against pathogens and nascent cancerous cells (D'Orazio et al., 2013).
- Chronic Effects (Photoaging): Chronic, cumulative exposure to UV radiation, particularly UVA, is the principal cause of extrinsic skin aging, or photoaging. This process is distinct from chronological aging and is characterized by deep wrinkles, a thick and leathery skin texture (solar elastosis), loss of elasticity due to collagen and elastin degradation, and irregular pigmentation, such as solar lentigines ("liver spots") and precancerous lesions known as actinic keratoses (American Cancer Society, 2024). It is estimated that up to 90% of the visible changes commonly attributed to aging are in fact the result of a lifetime of sun exposure (American Cancer Society, 2024).
- Photocarcinogenesis

The classification of UV radiation as a "complete carcinogen" is a powerful concept that frames the need for comprehensive protection (D'Orazio et al., 2013). This designation means that UV radiation acts as both a tumour initiator and a tumour promoter. It initiates carcinogenesis through its direct mutagenic effect on DNA, as described for UVB. It then promotes the growth and progression of these mutated cells by creating a favourable microenvironment through the generation of chronic inflammation, oxidative

stress, and immunosuppression (D'Orazio et al., 2013).

This dual-threat model explains why a truly effective photoprotective strategy must do more than simply block UV photons; it must also address the downstream promotional effects. Cumulative lifetime UV exposure is strongly linked to the development of NMSCs, while episodes of intense, intermittent exposure and blistering sunburns, especially during childhood, are significant risk factors for the development of malignant melanoma later in life (American Cancer Society, 2024).

A significant disconnect exists between the public's perception of sun damage and the underlying science. Consumers are conditioned to fear and avoid the acute, visible sign of UVB damage sunburn. However, the chronic, deeper, and more insidious damage from the far more abundant UVA radiation is often overlooked (Diffey, 2002). The traditional Sun Protection Factor (SPF) metric, which primarily measures protection against UVB-induced erythema, can create a dangerous false sense of security (Serpone, 2021). An individual using a high-SPF product with inadequate UVA protection may successfully avoid a sunburn and thus be encouraged to prolong their sun exposure. This behaviour, however, leads to a higher cumulative dose of UVA radiation, paradoxically increasing the risk of photoaging and certain skin cancers (Serpone, 2021). This highlights the absolute necessity of "broad-spectrum" protection that effectively attenuates both UVA and UVB radiation.

Table 1: Characteristics of Ultraviolet (UV) Radiation and its Biological Effects

UV Type	Wavelength Range (nm)	Atmospheric Penetration	Skin Penetration	Primary Mechanism of Damage
UVA	320–400	~95% of UV at surface	Deep (Dermis)	Indirect: Generation of ROS, Oxidative Stress
UVB	280–320	~5% of UV at surface	Superficial (Epidermis)	Direct: DNA absorption, formation of pyrimidine dimers
UVC	100–280	~0% (Absorbed by ozone)	Does not reach skin	N/A (from solar source)

3. CONVENTIONAL SUNSCREEN AGENTS: MECHANISMS AND LIMITATIONS

Topical sunscreens employ active ingredients, known as UV filters, that are broadly classified into two categories: physical (inorganic) and chemical (organic).

Physical (Inorganic) Filters

- Active Ingredients: The only two physical filters approved by regulatory bodies like the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) are zinc oxide (ZnO) and titanium dioxide.
- Mechanism of Action: A common misconception is that these mineral filters work solely by reflecting and scattering UV light like a mirror. While this action does occur, their primary mechanism of photoprotection, particularly when formulated with micronized or nano-sized particles, is the absorption of UV photons and their subsequent dissipation as harmless heat—a mechanism functionally similar to that of chemical filters (Matta et al., 2019).
- Advantages: Physical filters are highly valued for their excellent safety profile. They are photostable, meaning they do not degrade upon UV exposure, and they are less likely to cause skin irritation or allergic sensitization, making them the preferred choice for individuals with sensitive skin, rosacea, and for use in children's products . Zinc oxide, in particular, offers robust, broad-spectrum protection across the entire UVA and UVB range .
- Disadvantages: The main drawback of physical filters is cosmetic. In their non-nanoparticle form, they are opaque and can leave a noticeable white or pasty cast on the skin. To overcome this, manufacturers often use nanoparticles. While this improves transparency, it has raised some concerns

about the potential for these tiny particles to penetrate the skin, though current evidence suggests this risk is minimal with intact skin (Matta et al., 2019).

Chemical (Organic) Filters

- Active Ingredients: This category includes a wide range of organic compounds, such as oxybenzone (benzophenone-3), octinoxate (octyl methoxycinnamate), avobenzone, and octocrylene (Wang et al., 2012).
- Mechanism of Action: Chemical filters function by absorbing UV radiation. Their molecular structures contain aromatic rings and conjugated systems that capture the energy of UV photons, which excites the molecule to a higher, unstable energy state. The molecule then releases the absorbed energy as a small amount of heat (Wang et al., 2012).
- Advantages: Chemical sunscreens are prized for their cosmetic elegance. They can be formulated into lightweight, non-greasy lotions and sprays that spread easily and are transparent on the skin.
- Critical Limitations:
  - Systemic Absorption: Studies have confirmed that filters like oxybenzone and octinoxate are absorbed through the skin and detected in human plasma and urine (Matta et al., 2019). This has raised concerns regarding potential endocrine disruption.
  - Photostability: Some filters, like Avobenzone, are photolabile and can degrade significantly upon sun exposure unless stabilized.
  - Environmental Ecotoxicity: This is the most documented limitation. Up to 14,000 tons of sunscreen end up in oceans annually (Downs et al., 2016). Oxybenzone and octinoxate induce coral bleaching even at low concentrations and disrupt marine reproductive systems.

Table 2: Comparison of Conventional Physical and Chemical Sunscreen Filters

Feature	Physical (Inorganic) Filters	Chemical (Organic) Filters
Active Ingredients	Zinc Oxide, Titanium Dioxide	Oxybenzone, Octinoxate, Avobenzone
Mechanism	Absorb, reflect, and scatter UV	Absorb UV and convert to heat
Advantages	Low irritation, Photostable, Reef-safe	Cosmetically elegant, Easy to spread
Disadvantages	White cast, thick texture	Systemic absorption, Ecotoxicity

4. PHYTOCHEMICALS AS NATURAL PHOTOPROTECTANTS

The growing interest in herbal sunscreens stems from the recognition that phytochemicals offer a sophisticated and multifunctional approach to photoprotection (Saewan & Jimtaisong, 2015). Plants have evolved these compounds (flavonoids, polyphenols) over millions of years as a defense system against solar assault (Korać & Khambholja, 2011).

Multifunctional Mechanisms of Action

- Direct UV Absorption: Many phytochemicals contain aromatic rings that allow them to function as primary organic UV filters.
- Antioxidant Activity: Polyphenols and carotenoids neutralize free radicals, interrupting the oxidative cascade that damages DNA and collagen (Korać & Khambholja, 2011).
- Anti-inflammatory Effects: Plant compounds can downregulate pro-inflammatory signaling pathways like NF-κB, reducing erythema (Afaq & Katiyar, 2011).
- Modulation of Repair: Bioactive phytochemicals can enhance the cell's own DNA repair mechanisms and promote apoptosis in damaged cells (Afaq & Katiyar, 2011).

Key Classes of Photoprotective Phytochemicals

- Polyphenols and Flavonoids: Examples include catechins (green tea), resveratrol (grapes), and silymarin (milk thistle). They are

powerful antioxidants and anti-carcinogens (Nichols & Katiyar, 2010).
- Carotenoids: Beta-carotene and lycopene are highly efficient at quenching singlet oxygen generated by UVA (Saewan & Jimtaisong, 2015).
- Vitamins: Vitamin C and E work synergistically to protect against lipid peroxidation and regenerate antioxidant networks (Afaq & Katiyar, 2011).

5. EFFICACY OF MEDICINAL PLANTS IN SUNSCREEN FORMULATIONS

Camellia sinensis (Green Tea)
- Bioactive Compounds: Exceptionally rich in epigallocatechin gallate (EGCG) (Saewan & Jimtaisong, 2015).
- Efficacy: Reduces the number of sunburn cells and protects Langerhans cells from UV damage (Afaq & Katiyar, 2011). While its standalone SPF is low (2-6), it is a powerful SPF-booster

Aloe barbadensis (Aloe Vera)
- Bioactive Compounds: Contains polysaccharides (acemannan) and anthraquinones .
- Efficacy: Traditionally used for burns; provides profound soothing and moisturizing effects (Diffey, 2002). Aloin can directly absorb UV radiation (Danovaro et al., 2008).

Curcuma longa (Turmeric)
- Bioactive Compounds: Curcuminoids, specifically curcumin (Saewan & Jimtaisong, 2015).
- Efficacy: Inhibits UVB-induced activation of transcription factors like NF-κB, protecting against tumour promotion (Afaq & Katiyar, 2011).

Table 3: Selected Medicinal Plants with Demonstrated Photoprotective Properties

Plant	Key Bioactive Compounds	Mechanism of Action	Reported in vitro SPF
Green Tea	EGCG, Catechins	Antioxidant, DNA Repair	~2.4 [15]
Aloe Vera	Polysaccharides, Aloin	Anti-inflammatory, Soothing	~1.3 [63]
Turmeric	Curcuminoids	Antioxidant, Anti-carcinogenic	N/A [15]
Coconut Oil	Fatty Acids	Moisturizing, UV absorption	~7-8 [69]
Carrot	β-carotene	Quenches ROS	~6.9 [49]

6. FORMULATION, EVALUATION, AND STABILITY OF HERBAL SUNSCREEN CREAMS

Translating biological activity into a commercial product involves significant scientific hurdles.

Formulation Science and Challenges
- Creating Stable Emulsions: Incorporating complex plant extracts into oil-in-water (o/w) systems without causing phase separation is a primary challenge
- Photostability: Some phytochemicals are susceptible to photodegradation. Strategies to enhance stability include encapsulation in nanocarriers
- Sensory Characteristics: Consumer adherence depends on "cosmetic elegance." Achieving a lightweight, non-greasy profile is difficult with herbal formulations .

7. CONCLUSION

The transition toward herbal sunscreen formulations represents a critical intersection of dermatological science, environmental ethics, and consumer demand for "clean" beauty. While conventional synthetic filters provide high levels of UVB protection, their systemic absorption and documented ecotoxicity have created a necessary push for alternatives. Phytochemicals, particularly polyphenols, flavonoids, and carotenoids, offer a unique, multi-layered defense mechanism that goes beyond simple UV filtering to include potent antioxidant and anti-inflammatory properties.

However, the future of herbal photoprotection relies on overcoming formulation hurdles—specifically ensuring photostability, achieving cosmetic elegance, and standardizing the bioactive content of plant extracts. As research continues to validate the synergy between botanical extracts and mineral filters, the development of truly broad-spectrum, reef-safe, and skin-compatible sunscreens becomes a reachable goal for public health.

8. REFERENCES

1. Afaq, F., Katiyar, S.K., 2011. Polyphenols: Skin photoprotection and inhibition of photocarcinogenesis. Mini Rev. Med. Chem. 11(14), 1200–1215. https://doi.org/10.2174/13895711797655407
2. American Cancer Society, 2024. Cancer Facts & Figures: Skin Cancer Risk Factors. https://www.cancer.org
3. Autier, P., Boniol, M., Doré, J.F., 2007. Sunscreen use and duration of sun exposure: A systematic review. Int. J. Cancer 121(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.22768
4. Brenner, M., Hearing, V.J., 2008. The protective role of melanin against UV damage in human skin. Photochem. Photobiol. 84(3), 539–549. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-1097.2007.00226.x
5. Ciappellano, S., Tedesco, E., Venturini, M., Porrini, M., 2016. In vitro evaluation of sun protection factor in botanical extracts. J. Cosmet. Sci. 67(3), 177–186. https://www.scientificsocieties.org/article/
6. Danovaro, R., Bongiorni, L., Corinaldesi, C., et al., 2008. Sunscreens cause coral bleaching by promoting viral infections. Environ. Health Perspect. 116(4), 441–447. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.10966
7. Diffey, B.L., 2002. Sources and measurement of ultraviolet radiation. Methods 28(1), 4–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1046-2023(02)00204-9
8. DiNardo, J.C., Downs, C.A., 2018. Dermatological and environmental toxicological impact of oxybenzone. J. Cosmet. Dermatol. 17(1), 15–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocd.12449
9. D'Orazio, J., Jarrett, S., Amaro-Ortiz, A., Scott, T., 2013. UV radiation and the skin. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 14(6), 12222–12248. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms140612222
10. Downs, C.A., Kramarsky-Winter, E., Segal, R., et al., 2016. Toxicopathological effects of oxybenzone on coral planulae. Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 70(2), 265–288. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-015-0227-7
11. Fabricant, D.S., Farnsworth, N.R., 2001. Plants used in traditional medicine for drug discovery. Environ. Health Perspect. 109(Suppl 1), 69–75. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.01109s169
12. Food and Drug Administration, 2021. Sunscreen drug products for over-the-counter human use. Federal Register. https://www.federalregister.gov
13. Gianeti, M.D., Mercurio, D.G., Campos, P.M.B.G., 2013. Green tea extract in cosmetic formulations. Dermatol. Ther. 26(3), 267–271. https://doi.org/10.1111/dth.12044
14. Halliwell, B., Gutteridge, J.M.C., 2015. Free Radicals in Biology and Medicine, 5th ed. Oxford University Press. https://global.oup.com
15. Hu, S., Jiang, X., Yang, Y., 2018. Nanocarriers improving photostability of sunscreen actives. Int. J. Pharm. 547(1–2), 8–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2018.05.030
16. Katiyar, S.K., Ahmad, N., Mukhtar, H., 2001. Green tea and skin cancer. J. Nutr. Biochem. 12(5), 287–296. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0955-2863(01)00155-9
17. Kaur, C.D., Saraf, S., 2010. In vitro SPF determination of herbal oils. Pharmacogn. Res. 2(1), 22–26. https://doi.org/10.4103/0974-8490.60586
18. Korać, R.R., Khambholja, K.M., 2011. Herbs in skin protection from UV radiation. Pharmacogn. Rev. 5(10), 164–173. https://doi.org/10.4103/0973-7847.91102
19. Lhiaubet-Vallet, V., Marin, M.J., Miranda, M.A., 2010. Filter–filter interactions in sunscreens. Photochem. Photobiol. Sci. 9(4), 552–558. https://doi.org/10.1039/B9PP00176A
20. Lomas, A., Leonardi-Bee, J., Bath-Hextall, F., 2012. Worldwide incidence of nonmelanoma skin cancer. Br. J. Dermatol. 166(5), 1069–1080. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2133.2012.10830.x
21. Matta, M.K., Zusterzeel, R., Pilli, N.R., et al., 2019. Plasma concentration of sunscreen active ingredients. JAMA 321(21), 2082–2091. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2019.5586
22. Morabito, K., Shapley, D., Tripathi, A., 2011. Sunscreen efficacy and safety issues. Integr.

Environ. Assess. Manag. 7(2), 186–195. https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.123
23. Nash, J.F., 2006. Safety and efficacy of ultraviolet filters. Dermatol. Clin. 24(1), 35–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.det.2005.09.003
24. Nichols, J.A., Katiyar, S.K., 2010. Natural polyphenols and skin photoprotection. Arch. Dermatol. Res. 302(2), 71–83. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00403-009-1001-3
25. Pinnell, S.R., Fairhurst, D., Kollias, N., 2000. Microfine zinc oxide as sunscreen. Dermatol. Surg. 26(4), 309–314. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1524-4725.2000.99123.x
26. Reuter, J., Wölfle, U., Schempp, C., 2010. Anti-inflammatory potential of Aloe vera. Skin Pharmacol. Physiol. 23(2), 99–106. https://doi.org/10.1159/000265552
27. Saewan, N., Jimtaisong, A., 2015. Photoprotection of natural products. J. Cosmet. Dermatol. 14(1), 47–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocd.12123
28. Sayre, R.M., Dowdy, J.C., Gerwig, A.J., 2005. Photostability testing of avobenzone. Photochem. Photobiol. 81(2), 452–456. https://doi.org/10.1562/2004-06-22-RA-203
29. Schneider, S.L., Lim, H.W., 2019. Environmental effects of oxybenzone. J. Am. Acad. Dermatol. 80(1), 266–271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2018.06.033
30. Serpone, N., 2021. Sunscreens and their role in photoprotection. Photochem. Photobiol. Sci. 20(5), 729–747. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43630-021-00039-2
31. Singh, S., Sharma, A., Gupta, S., 2013. SPF determination of herbal oils. Pharmacogn. Res. 5(4), 298–300. https://doi.org/10.4103/0974-8490.118825
32. Smijs, T.G., Pavel, S., 2011. ZnO and TiO_2 nanoparticles in sunscreens. Nanotechnol. Sci. Appl. 4, 95–112. https://doi.org/10.2147/NSA.S19419
33. Surjushe, A., Vasani, R., Saple, D.G., 2008. Aloe vera: A short review. Indian J. Dermatol. 53(4), 163–166. https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5154.44785
34. Tadros, T.F., 2013. Emulsion Formation and Stability. Wiley-VCH. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com
35. Wang, S.Q., Burnett, M.E., Lim, H.W., 2012. Safety of oxybenzone. Arch. Dermatol. 148(11), 1247–1248. https://doi.org/10.1001/archdermatol.2012.2800

