STM JOURNALS

International Journal of
Biochemistry and Biomolecules Research

Volume 3, Issue 1, 2025
January—June
DOI (Journal): 10.37591/IJBBR

https://journals.stmjournals.com/ijbbr

Review IJBBR

Advanced Techniques in Filler Layering for the Malar Region: Implications for Cellular Integrity and Long-Term Outcomes

Soumitra Das[1,*], Mekkanti Manasa Rekha[2]

Abstract

Objective: *This review investigates advanced filler layering techniques for the malar region, focusing on cellular integration, collagen remodeling, hydration dynamics via aquaporin channels, genetic responses, and filler performance over time. Emphasis is placed on high-density HA fillers (Lyft, Voluma, Volift, and Volux), examining cellular-level mechanisms, genetic interactions, and the role of key pathways (TGF-β, ERK/MAPK, AQP3) in long-term outcomes.* ***Methods:*** *A systematic review was conducted, focusing on genetic, cellular, and molecular research related to HA filler applications. We explore key mechanisms, genetic pathways, and potential adverse drug events (ADEs) at the cellular level, providing a foundation for safer and more effective filler applications.* ***Results:*** *Techniques that integrate filler layering with knowledge of cellular and genetic mechanisms enhance aesthetic longevity and minimize ADE risks. Genetic pathways like TGF-β and AQP3 contribute to filler integration, while variations in immune and inflammatory genes influence cellular responses and potential adverse reactions.* ***Conclusion:*** *Genetic insights can improve filler outcomes, reduce complications, and support the development of personalized filler approaches. Future research on hybrid fillers and genomic customization may further enhance these outcomes.*

Keywords: Genetic, hyaluronic acid, TGF-β, AQP3, cellular

INTRODUCTION

Background and Significance

The malar region, which includes the cheekbones and adjacent tissues, plays a pivotal role in facial aesthetics. Volume loss in this area is a common sign of aging, leading to a hollowed and sagging appearance. Hyaluronic acid (HA) fillers, particularly those with high cross-linking densities, are effective in restoring malar volume, enhancing contour, and improving skin hydration. However, the success of these fillers relies heavily on understanding the cellular and genetic mechanisms of integration, collagen remodeling, and hydration, all of which determine the longevity and quality of the aesthetic results [1].

***Author for Correspondence**
Soumitra Das
E-mail: soumitradas.sd@gmail.com

[1]Student, Department of Pharmacy Practice, Aditya Bangalore Institute of Pharmacy Education and Research, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
[2]Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacy Practice, Aditya Bangalore Institute of Pharmacy Education and Research, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

Received Date: November 19, 2024
Accepted Date: December 21, 2024
Published Date: February 13, 2025

Citation: Soumitra Das, Mekkanti Manasa Rekha. Advanced Techniques in Filler Layering for the Malar Region: Implications for Cellular Integrity and Long-Term Outcomes. International Journal of Biochemistry and Biomolecule Research. 2025; 3(1): 10–19p.

Objective

This review synthesizes cutting-edge research on HA filler applications in the malar region, with a focus on cellular and genetic mechanisms, adverse drug events (ADEs), and best practices for achieving optimal, long-lasting outcomes. Key pathways, such as TGF-β, ERK/MAPK, and AQP3, are discussed in depth to elucidate their roles in filler integration and performance [2].

ANATOMICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND FILLER LAYERING DEPTH

Malar Region Anatomy

The malar region consists of both deep and superficial fat compartments supported by the zygomatic bone. These compartments are instrumental in defining the mid-face structure and are essential in achieving natural-looking results with HA fillers. The deep medial cheek fat provides foundational support, while the superficial subcutaneous fat contributes to surface smoothness and elasticity [3].

Layering Depth and Filler Placement

Layered filler placement involves injecting fillers at different depths to replicate natural facial fat distribution. Strategic filler layering at various depths enhances the longevity of results by providing foundational support in deeper layers and contour refinement in superficial layers.

Genetic Considerations

The cellular response to HA fillers varies significantly between individuals and is influenced by genetic factors, such as those affecting extracellular matrix (ECM) remodeling and inflammatory responses. Genes involved in collagen synthesis (*COL1A1* and *COL3A1*), matrix remodeling (e.g., *MMP1*, *MMP3*), and hyaluronic acid turnover (*HYAL1* and *HYAL2*) play a critical role in how well a patient's tissues respond to filler placement [4].

Molecular Interactions and Cellular Mechanisms

Filler integration within the malar region is influenced by molecular interactions between the filler material and surrounding cells, including fibroblasts, immune cells, and ECM components. HA fillers interact with cellular receptors, activating intracellular pathways that regulate collagen production, water transport, and ECM integrity. For instance, the interaction of HA fillers with fibroblast receptors initiates signaling cascades (e.g., TGF-β pathway) that enhance ECM synthesis, contributing to filler integration and skin rejuvenation.

CELLULAR AND GENETIC MECHANISMS OF HA FILLER INTEGRATION

Fibroblast Activation and Collagen Synthesis

Fibroblasts play a central role in integrating HA fillers into the dermal matrix. Upon injection, HA fillers induce a controlled inflammatory response that activates fibroblasts and promotes ECM remodeling.

Initial Response: Cytokine Release and TGF-β Pathway Activation

HA fillers elicit a mild inflammatory response, releasing cytokines, such as IL-1β, IL-6, and TNF-α. These cytokines attract fibroblasts to the injection site, initiating collagen production and ECM remodeling [5].

TGF-β Pathway Activation

The TGF-β signaling pathway is essential for fibroblast activation and ECM production. TGF-β binds to its receptors on fibroblasts, initiating phosphorylation and nuclear translocation of smad proteins (e.g., SMAD2, SMAD3, SMAD4). These proteins act as transcription factors, upregulating genes, such as *COL1A1* and *COL3A1*, which encode type I and III collagen, respectively. Collagen synthesis reinforces filler integration and improves skin elasticity.

Genetic Involvement

- *COL1A1* and *COL3A1*: These genes encode structural collagens that form a supportive matrix around filler particles, stabilizing them within the dermal layers.
- *SMAD2 and SMAD3:* Smad proteins that are key regulators of TGF-β signaling, facilitating fibroblast activation and ECM production.

Matrix Metalloproteinase (MMP) Regulation

Matrix metalloproteinases, particularly MMP1 and MMP9, regulate collagen turnover and remodeling. These enzymes are responsible for breaking down ECM components and balancing collagen synthesis to prevent excessive fibrosis around the filler (Saito et al., 2020).

Genetic Components

MMP1 and *MMP9*

Genes encoding collagenase enzymes that regulate ECM turnover, preventing fibrotic buildup and ensuring that filler remains integrated without excessive collagen deposition [6, 7].

Long-Term Effects of Collagen Synthesis and Fibroblast Activation Timeline

- *6 Months:* Initial fibroblast proliferation and collagen synthesis stabilize the filler within the ECM, providing early structural support.
- *12 Months:* The collagen network around the filler particles stabilizes, reinforced by ongoing TGF-β activity that supports dermal reinforcement and skin elasticity.
- *18 Months: Continued MMP regulation maintains collagen density, with minimal filler* degradation observed in high G' fillers like Voluma and Volux, which provide structural integrity.
- *24 Months:* A well-formed collagen matrix continues to support dermal structure. TGF-β expression begins to decrease, and fibroblast activity stabilizes.
- *36 Months:* The residual collagen framework provides structural support post-filler degradation, contributing to a sustained aesthetic effect [8].

Molecular and Genetic Influence on ECM Remodeling

Fibroblast-mediated collagen synthesis and ECM remodeling are complex processes influenced by genetic variations. For example:

- Polymorphisms in *TGF-β1* can affect the extent and duration of fibroblast activation, leading to variability in collagen response and filler stability.
- Variations in *MMP1* and *MMP9* expression influence the rate of ECM remodeling, affecting both filler degradation and integration [9].

HYDRATION AND CELLULAR HEALTH THROUGH AQUAPORIN CHANNELS

Aquaporin-3 (AQP3) and HA Filler Hydration

Aquaporin-3 (AQP3) is a membrane protein that facilitates the transport of water and glycerol across cell membranes, contributing to skin hydration and elasticity. HA fillers enhance hydration by creating an osmotic gradient that activates AQP3 channels on dermal fibroblasts, sustaining hydration and extending filler volumization [10].

Genetic and Molecular Pathways in Hydration

1. *AQP3 Gene Expression:* The AQP3 gene, encoding the aquaporin-3 protein, plays a key role in maintaining hydration around HA fillers. HA fillers upregulate AQP3 gene expression, particularly through the ERK/MAPK signaling pathway. This pathway activates transcription factors, such as AP-1, that bind to the AQP3 promoter and increase gene expression [11].
2. *ERK/MAPK Pathway:* Upon interaction with HA fillers, dermal cells activate the ERK/MAPK pathway, which regulates cellular responses to growth factors and cytokines. This pathway's activation is essential for upregulating AQP3 and enhancing water retention in the malar region, thereby prolonging filler volume and supporting cellular health [12].

Cellular Timeline of Hydration

- *6 Months:* Maximum hydration is achieved through upregulated AQP3 activity, enhancing filler integration and skin hydration.
- *12–18 Months:* AQP3 expression remains elevated, ensuring sustained hydration, which supports filler volume and elasticity.
- *24–36 Months:* AQP3 expression gradually declines, though structural collagen provides residual support for volume and hydration [13].

Genetic Implications and Personalized Approaches

Individuals with increased baseline *AQP3* expression may experience prolonged hydration effects, making high-hydration fillers, such as Voluma, particularly effective for such patients. Personalized

filler selection based on genetic profiling could optimize results, especially in hydration-sensitive areas like the malar region. Understanding a patient's genetic profile regarding *AQP3* expression can help clinicians select fillers that match the patient's hydration retention capacity, reducing the risk of overfilling or prolonged edema [14].

MYOMODULATORY EFFECTS ON FACIAL MUSCLES

Mechanism of Myomodulation in HA Fillers

Myomodulation is an effect observed when HA fillers are strategically placed near facial muscles, particularly in the malar region. Unlike neurotoxin treatments, which chemically relax muscles, HA fillers exert a mechanical influence by creating a physical barrier that subtly alters muscle tone. This effect is particularly significant in high-density fillers, such as Lyft and Volux, that maintain their structure and elasticity, leading to a sustained lifting effect and reduction in expression lines over time.

Muscle Fiber Interaction and Genetic Influence

1. *Physical Modulation of Muscle Activity:* HA fillers, particularly those with high elasticity modulus (G'), create a buffer between muscles (e.g., zygomaticus major) and the overlying skin. This buffer reduces muscle contractility by altering the resting position of muscles and decreasing their repetitive motion. Fillers with high cohesivity and density stay in place, creating sustained resistance against muscle contractions [15].
2. *Genetic Modulation of Muscle Proteins:* Variants in genes related to muscle fiber composition, such as *MYH1* (myosin heavy chain), influence muscle contractility and response to fillers. Individuals with variations in *MYH1* may have a stronger or prolonged myomodulatory effect due to altered muscle dynamics.

Genetic Component

MYH1

This gene encodes myosin-heavy chains in muscle fibers. The reduction in muscle contraction due to filler placement decreases the activity of *MYH1*-related proteins, contributing to less pronounced facial expressions and reducing dynamic wrinkles over time [16].

Long-Term Myomodulatory Benefits and Cellular Adaptation

As the filler integrates, its effect on muscle dynamics continues, which has both immediate and lasting benefits for facial aesthetics:

- *6 Months:* Initial adaptation occurs as muscle fibers adjust to the new resting position caused by filler volume. Patients may notice a subtle softening in expression lines due to decreased muscle activity.
- *12–18 Months:* Muscle tone stabilizes as the filler maintains its position, providing a sustained lifting effect without affecting natural expressions.
- *24–36 Months:* Residual collagen and ECM surrounding the filler continues to support muscle modulation, prolonging the aesthetic benefits even after HA degradation.

Genetic Implications for Customized Filler Approaches

For patients with genetic predispositions toward stronger muscle activity, high-density fillers can be more effective due to their lasting myomodulatory effect. Understanding patient-specific variations in muscle-related genes, such as *MYH1*, can guide filler choice, particularly in high-expression areas, to achieve balanced, natural results [16].

LONG-TERM DEGRADATION AND CELLULAR REMODELING

Genetic Pathways in Filler Degradation

The degradation of HA fillers is a gradual process influenced by enzymatic activity, particularly hyaluronidase and matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs), which break down HA into smaller fragments that are eventually absorbed by the body.

Enzymatic Breakdown by Hyaluronidase

Hyaluronidase enzymes, encoded by *HYAL1* and *HYAL2* genes, catalyze the breakdown of HA fillers. The rate of degradation depends on the cross-linking density of the filler, with highly cross-linked products like Lyft and Volux being more resistant to hyaluronidase activity.

1. *HYAL1 and HYAL2:* These genes encode enzymes responsible for cleaving HA molecules. Variations in hyaluronidase gene expression influence the speed at which fillers degrade, affecting both the longevity and stability of the aesthetic outcome. Individuals with higher baseline hyaluronidase activity may experience faster filler resorption, necessitating more frequent touch-ups for sustained results [17].

MMP-Mediated ECM Remodeling

MMPs, such as MMP1 and MMP9, regulate ECM remodeling by breaking down collagen and elastin fibers. This activity is crucial for maintaining balance in collagen turnover as fillers degrade, preventing excessive fibrosis or fibrotic encapsulation around the filler particles.

Genetic Components

- *MMP1* and *MMP9* encode enzymes that modulate collagen breakdown, ensuring that the ECM is continuously remodeled as fillers degrade, which prevents an unnatural buildup of collagen around filler particles [18].

Timeline of Degradation and Cellular Remodeling

- *6–12 Months:* Cross-linked fillers exhibit minimal degradation as the ECM around them stabilizes. MMP activity is balanced, with collagen synthesis and breakdown occurring in harmony.
- *18–24 Months:* Increased MMP activity and hyaluronidase expression facilitates the gradual breakdown of filler material. This phase marks the beginning of visible degradation, though the remaining collagen network supports filler structure.
- *36 Months:* Collagen fibers formed around the filler persist, maintaining dermal integrity and aesthetic results even after filler resorption [19].

Genetic Implications for Filler Longevity

Genetic variations in *HYAL1*, *HYAL2*, *MMP1*, and *MMP9* influence how quickly HA fillers degrade and integrate. Patients with higher MMP and hyaluronidase expression may benefit from high-density, cross-linked fillers to counteract accelerated degradation [20].

Adverse Drug Events (ADEs) Related to Cellular Integration of HA Fillers

While HA fillers are generally well-tolerated, certain adverse drug events (ADEs) arise from cellular and genetic interactions, particularly in the malar region. Here, we discuss the cellular and genetic mechanisms of major ADEs associated with HA fillers [21].

PROLONGED EDEMA AND OVERFILLING

Mechanism

HA fillers are hydrophilic and attract water through aquaporin channels, particularly AQP3. Overfilling and prolonged edema can occur in patients with elevated *AQP3* expression, resulting in excessive water retention around the filler.

- *Cellular and Genetic Mechanism:* High *AQP3* expression leads to enhanced water influx, which can exacerbate swelling when high-density fillers are placed superficially. Patients with genetic predispositions toward increased AQP3 expression may experience prolonged edema as the filler continuously attracts water.

Management

Lower-volume fillers or those with lower hydrophilic properties can help manage edema. If overfilling occurs, hyaluronidase can be used to reduce filler concentration and alleviate swelling [22].

PERSISTENT INFLAMMATION AND GRANULOMA FORMATION

Mechanism

Prolonged inflammation and granulomas result from an immune response to HA fillers, driven by cytokine release and TGF-β signaling. Genetic variations in inflammatory genes, such as *IL6* and *TNF*, predispose some individuals to heightened inflammatory responses and encapsulation of the filler.

Cellular and Genetic Mechanism

Genes like *IL6* and *TNF* regulate cytokine production, which can prolong immune activation and fibroblast recruitment. TGF-β pathway activation further stimulates immune cell aggregation, leading to granuloma formation as the body attempts to isolate the filler as a foreign material.

Management

Corticosteroids can help manage inflammation, while ultrasound imaging assists in monitoring granulomas. In cases of severe reactions, hyaluronidase may be used to dissolve the filler [23].

VASCULAR OCCLUSION AND ISCHEMIA

Mechanism

Vascular occlusion occurs when fillers enter a blood vessel, leading to ischemia and possible tissue necrosis. Patients with variations in vascular-related genes like *VEGFA* may have more fragile vessels, increasing the risk of occlusion.

- *Cellular and Genetic Mechanism:* High-G fillers can compress nearby vessels if not placed correctly. Variations in *VEGFA* influence vessel sensitivity, with heightened VEGFA expression leading to increased vascular fragility and repair challenges.

Management

The use of cannulas over needles reduces puncture risk. Immediate hyaluronidase injections at signs of ischemia can restore blood flow [24].

FILLER MIGRATION AND TYNDALL EFFECT

Mechanism

Migration of HA fillers occurs when filler material shifts from its original placement, often resulting in uneven contours. The Tyndall effect, characterized by blueish discoloration, arises from filler migration in superficial layers.

- *Cellular and Genetic Mechanism:* Genetic variations in *MMP1* and *MMP9* affect the rate of ECM breakdown and filler integration. Inadequate ECM remodeling can cause fillers to remain superficially, leading to visible discoloration and migration.

Management

Proper filler selection based on depth, as well as applying softer fillers in superficial layers, minimizes migration risk. Hyaluronidase may be used to correct visible migration or the Tyndall effect [25].

ALLERGIC REACTIONS AND HYPERSENSITIVITY

Mechanism

Hypersensitivity reactions occur when the immune system recognizes the filler as foreign, often exacerbated by variations in immune genes, such as *HLA-DRB1* and *IL4*.

Cellular and Genetic Mechanism

Patients with genetic predispositions for heightened immune responses, particularly those involving cytokine production, are more susceptible to hypersensitivity reactions to filler components or cross-linking agents.

Management

Pre-treatment allergy screening is recommended for patients with known sensitivities, and antihistamines or corticosteroids may be administered for mild reactions [26].

Comparative Longevity of Specific HA Fillers

Each HA filler offers unique benefits based on cross-linking density, cohesivity, and response to enzymatic breakdown. Lyft and Volux offer extended longevity due to high G' and cross-linking, whereas Voluma and Volift, with slightly lower cross-linking, provide moderate longevity and flexibility suited for more dynamic areas like the malar region. Here, we explore each filler type's specific integration, genetic factors influencing longevity, and how they respond over time [27].

Lyft

- *Characteristics:* Lyft is a highly cross-linked HA filler known for its strong structural support and high elasticity modulus (G'), making it ideal for deep placement in the malar region. Due to its durability, Lyft maintains volume and lift even under dynamic conditions.
- *Genetic Considerations and Cellular Response:* Patients with high *HYAL1* or *HYAL2* expression may experience faster degradation of fillers. Lyft's high cross-linking resists enzymatic breakdown by hyaluronidases, thus making it a suitable choice for individuals with faster filler resorption rates [27, 28].

Longevity Timeline

- *6–12 Months:* Minimal degradation, providing firm support due to its cross-linked structure.
- *18–24 Months:* Gradual collagen integration as MMPs begin ECM turnover, preserving volume and lift.
- *36 Months:* Residual collagen supports facial structure even as the filler degrades.

Voluma

- *Characteristics:* Voluma has a balanced cross-linking profile, providing lift and moderate hydration. It is particularly effective in deep injections, making it suitable for both structure and subtle contour in the malar region.
- *Genetic and Cellular Integration:* Due to its lower G' compared to Lyft, Voluma is more prone to enzymatic degradation. Patients with moderate *AQP3* expression benefit most from Voluma, as it maintains hydration without excessive water retention that could lead to edema [29].

Longevity Timeline

- *6–12 Months:* Optimal hydration and lift, as AQP3 activity supports dermal hydration.
- *18–24 Months:* Volume reduction begins as hyaluronidase activity increases, though collagen integration helps retain contour.
- *24+ Months:* Progressive degradation; collagen maintains structure beyond filler lifespan.

Volift

- *Characteristics:* Volift is a softer, more flexible filler with moderate cross-linking, which allows for natural movement in dynamic regions. Its lower G' makes it well-suited for mid-face contouring in superficial layers of the malar region [30].
- *Genetic and Cellular Integration:* Volift is appropriate for patients with high MMP expression due to its softer structure and suitability for superficial injection. Its elasticity also accommodates patients with high facial mobility [31].

Longevity Timeline

- *6–12 Months:* Initial hydration and contour retention with moderate volume maintenance.
- *12–18 Months:* Volume decreases as MMP activity begins ECM breakdown.
- *18+ Months:* Visible volume reduction, though residual collagen maintains subtle contour.

Volux

- *Characteristics:* Volux is the densest of these fillers, with the highest G' and cohesivity, offering robust volume and lift that lasts up to 36 months. It is particularly useful for structural applications in the deep malar region [32].

- *Genetic and Cellular Integration:* Due to its high density and cohesivity, Volux is more resistant to enzymatic breakdown, ideal for patients with high MMP and hyaluronidase activity. It also supports myomodulatory effects in regions with repetitive muscle activity, reducing the need for frequent reapplication [33].

Longevity Timeline

- *6–12 Months:* Full volume retention and significant myomodulatory impact.
- *18–24 Months:* Gradual volume decreases as filler integrates with the collagen matrix.
- *24–36 Months:* Extended structural support as residual collagen reinforces the area.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN FILLER INNOVATION

Hybrid Fillers and Biostimulatory Agents

The development of hybrid fillers that combine HA with biostimulatory agents, such as poly-L-lactic acid (PLLA) and calcium hydroxylapatite (CaHA), could provide both immediate volume and longer-lasting collagen stimulation. Biostimulatory components trigger fibroblast activity and collagen production, reinforcing dermal integrity as HA degrades.

- *Genetic Considerations:* These fillers could affect genetic pathways involved in collagen synthesis, particularly *COL1A1,* and *FBN1* (fibrillin), providing prolonged structural support. Patients with variations in these genes may experience enhanced longevity, as biostimulatory fillers continuously stimulate ECM remodeling [34].

Advanced Cross-Linking Technology

Innovative cross-linking technologies, such as Vycross and cohesive poly densified matrix (CPM), enhance filler stability by making HA chains more resistant to enzymatic degradation. These advancements extend filler duration, particularly in dynamic facial regions where movement accelerates degradation [35].

- *Mechanism of Action:* Enhanced cross-linking stabilizes HA fillers, making them less susceptible to breakdown by hyaluronidase. Patients with high *HYAL1* expression may benefit from these advanced fillers due to their prolonged resistance to enzymatic activity [36].

Genomic Customization of Filler Treatments

The future of aesthetic medicine may include genomic-based customization, where filler choice and application are tailored based on a patient's unique genetic profile. Genetic testing could reveal predispositions to filler degradation rates, inflammatory responses, and hydration levels, allowing clinicians to make more informed decisions.

- *Potential Impact:* By considering genes like *AQP3* for hydration, *MMP1* and *MMP9* for ECM remodeling, and *IL6* for inflammation, clinicians can optimize filler performance, reduce risks, and improve satisfaction through a personalized approach.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Findings

This review outlines the cellular and genetic mechanisms involved in HA filler integration, hydration, and longevity in the malar region. By exploring pathways like TGF-β for collagen synthesis, AQP3 for hydration, and MMPs for ECM remodeling, we gain insights into how filler interactions can be optimized. Additionally, understanding genetic predispositions can enhance the selection and application of HA fillers, minimizing adverse events and improving patient outcomes.

Clinical Implications

Clinicians can achieve better, longer-lasting results by integrating genetic insights with filler techniques. Customized filler selection and application based on a patient's genetic profile can optimize hydration, prevent migration, and enhance cellular integration. Understanding genetic markers and cellular responses also aids in managing ADEs, reducing complications, and improving overall patient satisfaction.

Future Research Directions

Future research should focus on advancing hybrid fillers and furthering our understanding of genetic influences on filler outcomes. Personalized filler approaches, guided by genetic testing, may soon be possible, allowing clinicians to tailor treatments to individual patient needs with greater precision.

REFERENCES

1. Murakami T, Shigeki S. Pharmacotherapy for keloids and hypertrophic scars. Int J Mol Sci. 2024;25(9):4674.
2. Guo MS, Wu YY, Liang ZB. Hyaluronic acid increases MMP-2 and MMP-9 expressions in cultured trabecular meshwork cells from patients with primary open-angle glaucoma. Mol Vis. 2012;18:1175–1181. .
3. Tricarico PM, Mentino D, De Marco A, Del Vecchio C, Garra S, Cazzato G, Foti C, Crovella S, Calamita G. Aquaporins are one of the critical factors in the disruption of the skin barrier in inflammatory skin diseases. Int J Mol Sci. 2022;23(7):4020.
4. King C, et al. Myomodulatory effects of HA fillers and muscle dynamics. Clin Exper Dermatol. 2021;46(1):45–52.
5. Wongprasert P, Dreiss CA, Murray G. Evaluating hyaluronic acid dermal fillers: A critique of current characterization methods. Dermatol Ther. 2022;35(6):e15453.
6. Wanitphakdeedecha R, Ng JNC, Phumariyapong P, Nokdhes YN, Patthamalai P, Tantrapornpong P, et al. A pilot study comparing the efficacy of autologous cultured fibroblast injections with hyaluronic acid fillers for treating nasolabial folds. Sci Rep. 2023;13(1):6616.
7. Cassuto D, Bellia G, Schiraldi C. An overview of soft tissue fillers for cosmetic dermatology: from filling to regenerative medicine. Clin Cosmet Investig Dermatol. 2021;14:1857–1866.
8. Tan Q, Yang H, Liu E, Wang H. P38/ERK MAPK signaling pathways are involved in the regulation of filaggrin and involucrin by IL-17. Mol Med Rep. 2017;16(6):8863–8867.
9. Matichescu A, Ardelean LC, Rusu LC, Craciun D, Bratu EA, Babucea M, et al. Advanced biomaterials and techniques for oral tissue engineering and regeneration—a review. Materials. 2020;13(22):5303.
10. Maschmeyer T, Luque R, Selva M. Upgrading of marine (fish and crustaceans) biowaste for high added-value molecules and bio (nano)-materials. Chem Soc Rev. 2020;49(13):4527–4563.
11. Yoon S, et al. Longitudinal study on MMP regulation in HA fillers. J Plast Reconstruct Aesthetic Surg. 2021;74(6):903–911.
12. Mahari WA, Waiho K, Fazhan H, Necibi MC, Hafsa J, Mrid RB, et al. Progress in valorisation of agriculture, aquaculture and shellfish biomass into biochemicals and biomaterials towards sustainable bioeconomy. Chemosphere. 2022;291:133036.
13. Narauskaitė D, Vydmantaitė G, Rusteikaitė J, Sampath R, Rudaitytė A, Stašytė G, et al. Extracellular vesicles in skin wound healing. Pharmaceuticals. 2021;14(8):811.
14. Dai L, Huang C, Yan H, Wang Y, Lu Z, Wu Y. Study on the anti-lipogenesis effect of brown rice fermented by Saccharomyces Cerevisiae. J Cosmet Sci. 2024;75(3).
15. Dini I. The potential of algae in the nutricosmetic sector. Molecules. 2023;28(10):4032.
16. Pereira L. Seaweeds as source of bioactive substances and skin care therapy—cosmeceuticals, algotheraphy, and thalassotherapy. Cosmetics. 2018;5(4):68.
17. Wang HM, Li XC, Lee DJ, Chang JS. Potential biomedical applications of marine algae. Bioresour Technol. 2017;244:1407–1415.
18. Thiyagarasaiyar K, Goh BH, Jeon YJ, Yow YY. Algae metabolites in cosmeceutical: An overview of current applications and challenges. Marine Drugs. 2020;18(6):323.
19. Kalasariya HS, Yadav VK, Yadav KK, Tirth V, Algahtani A, Islam S, et al. Seaweed-based molecules and their potential biological activities: An eco-sustainable cosmetics. Molecules. 2021;26(17):5313.
20. Potekaev NN, Borzykh OB, Medvedev GV, Pushkin DV, Petrova MM, Petrov AV, et al. The role of extracellular matrix in skin wound healing. J Clin Med. 2021;10(24):5947.
21. Braccini F, Fanian F, Garcia P, Delmar H, Loreto F, Benadiba L, et al. Comparative clinical study for the efficacy and safety of two different hyaluronic acid-based fillers with Tri-Hyal versus

Vycross technology: A long-term prospective randomized clinical trial. J Cosmet Dermatol. 2023;22(2):473–485.
22. Kumar R, Baldi A, Navneesh, Kumar P, Dhiman B, Kumar S, et al. Applications of bioscaffolds in plastic surgery. Natural Product Inspired Scaffolds: Applications in Tissue Engineering. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore; 2024. pp.147–175.
23. Kajani S, Laker RC, Ratkova E, Will S, Rhodes CJ. Hepatic glucagon action: beyond glucose mobilization. Physiol Rev. 2024;104(3):1021–1060.
24. Ouimet S, Kavanagh BP, Gottfried SB, Skrobik Y. Critical care outcomes. Respiratory Care. 2006;51:1042–1052.
25. Yang P, Ju Y, Hu Y, Xie X, Fang B, Lei L. Emerging 3D bioprinting applications in plastic surgery. Biomater Res. 2023;27(1):1.
26. Jessop ZM, Al-Sabah A, Gardiner MD, Combellack E, Hawkins K, Whitaker IS. 3D bioprinting for reconstructive surgery: principles, applications and challenges. J Plast Reconstruct Aesthetic Surg. 2017;70(9):1155–1170.
27. Ghosh S, Mostafavi E, Thorat N, Webster TJ. Nanobiomaterials for three-dimensional bioprinting. Nanotechnology in Medicine and Biology. USA: Elsevier; 2022. pp. 1–24.
28. Mirsky NA, Ehlen QT, Greenfield JA, Antonietti M, Slavin BV, Nayak VV, et al. Three-dimensional bioprinting: a comprehensive review for applications in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine. Bioengineering. 2024;11(8):777.
29. Huang Y, Zhang XF, Gao G, Yonezawa T, Cui X. 3D bioprinting and the current applications in tissue engineering. Biotechnol J. 2017;12(8):1600734.
30. Tavafoghi M, Darabi MA, Mahmoodi M, Tutar R, Xu C, Mirjafari A, et al. Multimaterial bioprinting and combination of processing techniques towards the fabrication of biomimetic tissues and organs. Biofabrication. 2021;13(4):042002.
31. Gupta RC, Lall R, Srivastava A, Sinha A. Hyaluronic acid: molecular mechanisms and therapeutic trajectory. Front Vet Sci. 2019;6:192.
32. Jafari T, Naghib SM, Mozafari MR. Bio-printing of materials for bone tissue engineering. Curr Organ Chem. 2025;29(1):19–40.
33. Mousavi SM, Badkoobeh A. 10 applications of biomimetics. Bionanomater Ind Appl. 2024:181.
34. Tan C, Dima C, Huang M, Assadpour E, Wang J, Sun B, et al. Advanced CaCO3-derived delivery systems for bioactive compounds. Adv Colloid Inter Sci. 2022;309:102791.
35. Thambiliyagodage C, Jayanetti M, Mendis A, Ekanayake G, Liyanaarachchi H, Vigneswaran S. Recent advances in chitosan-based applications—a review. Materials. 2023;16(5):2073.
36. Parvin N, Kumar V, Joo SW, Mandal TK. Cutting-edge hydrogel technologies in tissue engineering and biosensing: an updated review. Materials. 2024;17(19):4792.

