**RESEARCH PAPER**

# Clinicaltoxicities and Pharmacovigilance Challenges of Cosmetic Skin-Lightening Agents: A Comprehensive Review

Priyadarshini. KOYYA*, Vinod MUGADA, Anita SAHU, Tanusri BEHARA, Sirisha KOYYA, Chandrika MATHALA, Sanjana TAMADA and Jahnavi PALISETTI

*Department of Pharmacy Practice, Vignan Institute of Pharmaceutical Technology (A), Vishakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh.*

***Corresponding Author:***

*K.Priyadarshini*

*Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacy Practice, Vignan Institute of Pharmaceutical Technology (A), Vishakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh*

*E-mail: koyya.priyareddy@gmail.com*

***Received: 28th Feb, 2026; Revised: 6th March 2026; Accepted: 7th April, 2026; Available Online: 20th April, 2026***

**ABSTRACT**

The global skin-lightening industry, projected to reach USD 15.7 billion by 2030, constitutes a critical public health challenge driven by unregulated product use and systemic toxicological risks. This review examines the cutaneous and systemic consequences of three primary toxic agents—mercury, hydroquinone, and high-potency corticosteroids—which remain prevalent in informal markets despite international regulatory frameworks such as the Minamata Convention. We analyze epidemiological disparities across Africa, Asia, and the Americas, demonstrating how historically entrenched colorism and algorithmically amplified digital media sustain pervasive consumer demand. Furthermore, the paper identifies critical deficiencies in current cosmetovigilance frameworks, particularly in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs), where social stigma, e-commerce regulatory loopholes, and underdeveloped surveillance infrastructure impede adverse event reporting. Transcending superficial corporate rebranding, this review proposes a multi-tiered intervention strategy centered on community-based pharmacovigilance. The framework integrates clinical pharmacists as frontline safety sentinels within primary healthcare and deploys AI-enhanced mHealth platforms for real-time product surveillance and toxicity signal detection. By aligning stringent top-down regulatory enforcement with decentralized, bottom-up clinical monitoring, this review establishes an actionable roadmap to mitigate the severe health impacts of toxic depigmenting agents and protect vulnerable populations from irreversible cutaneous and systemic damage.

**Keywords**: *Pharmacovigilance; Cosmetovigilance; Mercury Toxicity; Hydroquinone; Colorism; Corticosteroid Abuse*

**How to cite this article**: Koyya P, Mugada V, Sahu A, Behara T, Koyya S, Mathala C, Tamada S, Palisetti J. Clinical Toxicities and Pharmacovigilance Challenges of Cosmetic Skin-Lightening Agents: A Comprehensive Review. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(46s): 534-543. DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.46s.58

**Source of support:** Nil.

**Conflict of interest:** None

## INTRODUCTION

Skin lightening, a practice rooted in antiquity, has evolved into a multi-billion-dollar industry and a persistent challenge in contemporary dermatology and public health [1]. Defined as the chemical reduction of melanin to achieve lighter pigmentation or correct pigmentary disorders, the practice exists on a continuum between medically supervised treatment and unregulated cosmetic misuse [2]. Global demand, driven by colorism—a systemic bias favoring lighter skin deeply entrenched in colonial hierarchies and modern media— has expanded the market to an estimated USD 8.8 billion in 2022, with projections suggesting it could reach around USD 15.7 billion by 2030[3].

Prevalence is highest among populations of color, with marked regional disparities across Africa, Asia, and the Americas. A meta-analysis of 68 studies encompassing over 67,000 participants estimates a pooled lifetime prevalence of 27.7%. Usage peaks among individuals aged ≤30 years (55.9%), urban residents (74.9%), and those with lower educational attainment (31.6%)[4]. Although historically female-dominated, recent data indicate a substantial increase in male users, with prevalence reaching 28% in some cohorts, signaling a demographic shift toward broader usage [2].

Clinical risk profiles depend on the distinction between therapeutic depigmentation and cosmetic misuse. Medical applications require professional oversight, specific indications, and controlled concentrations, whereas

*Author for Correspondence: koyya.priyareddy@gmail.com

cosmetic misuse typically involves unsupervised, chronic application across extensive body surfaces [5]. This shift in practice introduces severe risks: applications have expanded from localized treatment to whole-body use, from short-term clinical courses to decades-long daily regimens, and from standardized formulations to unregulated mixtures containing high-potency corticosteroids or industrial-grade hydroquinone [6].

This review examines the intersection of toxicological risks and regulatory enforcement gaps. The public health crisis centers on three primary toxic agents: mercury, hydroquinone, and corticosteroids [7]. Although their dermatological effects are well documented, systemic toxicities remain frequently misdiagnosed or underreported [8]. Furthermore, adverse reaction surveillance for cosmetics—termed cosmetovigilance—remains underdeveloped [9]. Most low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) have not yet achieved Level 3 maturity on the WHO Global Benchmarking Tool, resulting in significant pharmacovigilance data deficits [10]. Addressing the skin-lightening epidemic requires an interdisciplinary framework integrating dermatology, systemic toxicology, sociology, and regulatory policy. Accordingly, this review synthesizes global epidemiological data, delineates the clinical boundaries between therapeutic and cosmetic use, evaluates the toxicological profiles of key agents, and identifies critical failures in international regulatory enforcement.

**Toxicological Profiling of Skin-Lightening Agents**

The global expansion of the skin-lightening market reflects entrenched colorist beauty standards across the Asia-Pacific region, the Middle East, and Africa, where lighter skin is frequently associated with higher social status, aesthetic appeal, and employability [1]. Surging demand has fueled an unregulated informal market saturated with hazardous compounds, including inorganic mercury, high-dose hydroquinone, and potent corticosteroids. Clinical manifestations range from localized cutaneous damage to life-threatening systemic toxicity. Despite international frameworks such as the Minamata Convention [11], regulatory enforcement remains inconsistent, particularly in decentralized markets lacking medical oversight. This section profiles the toxicology of prevalent skin-lightening agents and evaluates systemic failures in pharmacovigilance and cosmetovigilance systems designed to protect consumer health [12].

**Heavy Metal Adulteration: Mercury**

Mercury persists as a primary adulterant in skin-lightening cosmetics due to its rapid depigmenting properties. Present in elemental, inorganic, and organic forms, inorganic mercury serves as the most common additive in bleaching creams and soaps [13]. Mercury inhibits melanogenesis by displacing copper ions in the active site of tyrosinase, thereby blocking the oxidation of tyrosine to melanin. Although the Minamata Convention and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) establish a cosmetic safety limit of 1 ppm (1 mg/kg), products in informal markets routinely exceed this threshold by orders of magnitude. A 2025 analysis of online skincare products across India and neighboring Asian countries revealed that 58% of samples exceeded 1 ppm, with one sample containing 144,893.9 mg/kg [14, 15]. Transdermal mercury absorption poses severe systemic risks. Following cutaneous penetration, mercury accumulates in the kidneys and central nervous system, triggering nephrotic syndrome, proteinuria, tremors, insomnia, memory impairment, and depression. Chronic exposure precipitates progressive renal failure and neuromuscular deterioration [13]. Fetal and neonatal health faces particular risk; mercury readily crosses the placental barrier and concentrates in breast milk. In one documented case, a pregnant woman using a 1% mercury-containing soap developed maternal blood mercury levels of 91 µg/L, with corresponding infant levels of 19 µg/L—both exceeding established safety thresholds [16]. Regional data underscore this crisis: popular creams in Jamaica contained mercury concentrations 13,546 times above the legal limit, correlating with widespread headaches and depression [14], while 45% of 38 commercial samples tested in Saudi Arabia exceeded 1 ppm [17].

**Unregulated Depigmenting Agents: Hydroquinone**

Historically the gold standard for treating melasma and other hyperpigmentary disorders, hydroquinone (HQ) has transitioned from a tightly regulated therapeutic agent to a widely abused cosmetic ingredient [18]. HQ suppresses melanin synthesis by inhibiting tyrosinase and inducing selective melanocyte cytotoxicity [19]. While effective at 2% in over-the-counter formulations and up to 5% in prescription preparations, prolonged or unsupervised use precipitates severe adverse effects [20]. Exogenous ochronosis (EO) represents the most severe cutaneous complication, manifesting as paradoxical blue-black, soot-like macules and patches, predominantly on the face and neck [20]. Tyrosinase-mediated oxidation converts HQ into reactive quinones, which deposit in the dermis and polymerize within collagen and elastic fibers to form characteristic ochronotic pigment. Although EO was historically associated only with high-concentration formulations, cases now emerge after years of continuous use with 2% HQ [21]. Regulatory agencies have progressively restricted HQ due to chronic safety concerns, including suspected carcinogenicity demonstrated in animal models [22.] The European Union banned cosmetic HQ in 2001 [23]. In 2019, India's Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) reclassified HQ as a Schedule H drug, mandating prescriptions for all topical preparations [22]. Saudi Arabia maintains similar prescription-only restrictions, yet 80% of illegally marketed skin-lightening products still contain HQ [24].

**Illicit Corticosteroid Incorporation**

The illicit incorporation of topical corticosteroids (TCs) into skin-lightening formulations constitutes a severe public health threat. Manufacturers frequently conceal potent or super-potent steroids—such as clobetasol propionate (0.05%), betamethasone dipropionate, and mometasone furoate—within products marketed as standard fairness creams [25]. These compounds induce

rapid cutaneous blanching through vasoconstriction and anti-inflammatory pathways, effects consumers frequently misinterpret as genuine depigmentation [26]. Chronic TC abuse produces characteristic cutaneous pathologies, including epidermal atrophy, telangiectasia, and striae distensae [27]. Furthermore, TCs suppress local immune responses, facilitating fungal proliferation and masking clinical morphology—a condition known as tinea incognito that significantly complicates diagnosis and management. Prolonged use also induces Topical Steroid-Dependent Face (TSDF), characterized by severe rebound erythema, burning, and desquamation upon discontinuation [25]. Systemic absorption poses an equally grave risk, particularly when applied to large surface areas or facial skin, which exhibits a reduced barrier thickness. Significant percutaneous absorption suppresses the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, precipitating iatrogenic Cushing syndrome (moon facies, dorsocervical fat pad, centripetal obesity) or acute adrenal crisis [28]. Pediatric populations face heightened risk due to elevated body surface area-to-weight ratios, increasing susceptibility to growth retardation [12]. Epidemiological data from abuse cases report tinea incognito in 49.46% of patients and acneiform eruptions in 30.27% [25].

**New Modulators: Glutathione and Tranexamic Acid**

Stricter regulations on traditional agents have positioned glutathione and tranexamic acid (TXA) as increasingly popular alternatives [29]. However, their transition from targeted therapeutics to mass-market cosmetics introduces novel safety and efficacy concerns [30]. Glutathione (GSH), a master antioxidant, exerts antimelanogenic effects by inhibiting tyrosinase and shifting melanogenesis from dark eumelanin to lighter pheomelanin production [30]. While topical (2%) and oral (250–500 mg/day) GSH formulations demonstrate effective melanin reduction with minimal adverse effects, intravenous (IV) administration faces substantial clinical criticism [31, 32]. IV glutathione infusions, widely marketed without standardized dosing across Asia and Africa, carry documented risks of anaphylaxis, hepatotoxicity, and Stevens-Johnson syndrome [30]. Tranexamic acid, a classical antifibrinolytic, has gained dermatological prominence for melasma management [32]. TXA inhibits the plasminogen/plasmin pathway, reducing arachidonic acid and prostaglandin release, thereby downregulating melanocyte stimulation. Oral TXA (250 mg twice daily) demonstrates high efficacy but carries theoretical thromboembolic risks. Topical (3–5%) and intradermal formulations offer comparable efficacy with significantly reduced systemic exposure and fewer irritant reactions compared to hydroquinone [31].

**Pharmacovigilance and Cosmetovigilance Challenges**

Surveillance of adverse effects associated with cosmetic skin-lightening agents constitutes a core component of cosmetovigilance [12]. Unlike pharmacovigilance, which integrates seamlessly into clinical medicine, cosmetovigilance faces substantial challenges regarding the proliferation of unregulated lightening products [33]. Chronic underreporting of adverse reactions presents a primary obstacle [33]. Consumers frequently dismiss mild reactions, such as itching and redness, as expected effects of skin bleaching or self-treat them rather than seek professional medical care [34]. A survey in Lahore revealed that only 18.6% of users experiencing adverse effects consulted a dermatologist; 46% discontinued use without medical evaluation, and 18.1% relied on home remedies [35]. Public awareness of cosmetovigilance remains critically low: only 20% of university graduates in a Turkish cohort recognized the term, while awareness dropped to zero among individuals with only primary education.

Products distributed through informal markets and street vendors typically lack ingredient disclosures or feature labels that deliberately conceal hazardous adulterants, including mercury and corticosteroids [1.] Social media now serves as the primary product discovery channel, with influencer endorsements and peer pressure frequently overriding evidence-based dermatological guidance. In Somalia, 67.3% of skin-lightening users based purchasing decisions on social media content, and 80.2% demonstrated low awareness of the associated health risks [1]. Furthermore, regulatory ambiguities complicate the classification of borderline products that exhibit both cosmetic and therapeutic properties [36]. In many jurisdictions, manufacturers exploit these definitional gaps to market pharmacologically active agents as cosmetics, thereby circumventing rigorous pre-market safety evaluations.

**Clinical Effects of Skin-Lightening Agents.**

The global skin-lightening industry has expanded from limited clinical applications into a multi-billion-dollar market, yet its transition to widespread over-the-counter (OTC) misuse has precipitated a public health crisis [37]. While dermatological indications remain restricted to supervised management of conditions such as eczema, unregulated consumer use drives extensive exposure, leading to severe cutaneous toxicity and life-threatening systemic organ damage [38].

The skin serves as the primary site of adverse reactions due to its direct interface with topical agents. Chronic exposure to hydroquinone and corticosteroids induces profound structural alterations in the epidermis and dermis. Exogenous ochronosis represents the most severe complication of prolonged hydroquinone use [37]. It manifests as progressive, asymptomatic blue-black hyperpigmentation at application sites [37]. Because this presentation mimics the hyperpigmentation patients initially seek to treat, users frequently escalate application of the offending agent. First described by Rudolf Virchow in 1865, exogenous ochronosis is an acquired, localized condition that predominantly affects individuals with darker skin phototypes [39]. Its pathogenesis involves competitive inhibition of homogentisic acid oxidase by hydroquinone, triggering polymerization and deposition of insoluble ochronotic pigment. Clinical diagnosis remains challenging, as lesions typically appear as bilaterally symmetrical speckled macules. Definitive diagnosis relies on histopathology, which reveals characteristic yellow-brown, banana-shaped collagen fibers within the dermis [39].

Management proves difficult: mandatory discontinuation yields only slow, partial improvement.

Topical corticosteroid misuse severely compromises cutaneous integrity. Although corticosteroids produce rapid lightening via vasoconstriction, chronic, unsupervised application induces marked tissue atrophy. At the molecular level, these agents inhibit keratinocyte proliferation and suppress collagen synthesis. The clinical hallmarks of chronic misuse include telangiectasia and persistent erythema driven by rebound vasodilation and vascular fragility [40]. Corticosteroid-induced dermatitis typically progresses through three stages: pre-atrophy, atrophy, and tachyphylaxis [41]. Furthermore, localized immunosuppression compromises cutaneous defense mechanisms, predisposing users to opportunistic infections. Tinea incognito represents the most frequent infection, as corticosteroids mask classic inflammatory signs [42]. Chronic application also triggers steroid-induced acneiform eruptions [43].

Beyond dermatological complications, chronic mercury exposure produces life-threatening systemic toxicity. Dermal absorption facilitates bioaccumulation in vital organs, causing irreversible renal, neurological, and hepatic injury. Mercury exerts its depigmenting effect by rapidly inactivating tyrosinase. Once absorbed, inorganic mercury exhibits high affinity for renal and neural tissues [45]. The kidneys serve as the primary accumulation site, with renal impairment representing the most common clinical manifestation. Nephrotoxicity operates through direct cellular toxicity and immune-mediated pathways, frequently presenting as nephrotic syndrome [13]. Clinical evidence supports this association: one documented case involved a male patient who developed stage II membranous nephropathy after applying a high-mercury cream [44], while another female patient developed minimal change disease linked to a product with excessively high mercury concentrations.

Neurotoxicity develops insidiously, often presenting with nonspecific neuropsychiatric symptoms at onset. Mercury disrupts endothelial integrity and enzymatic function in the cerebral microvasculature, compromising the blood-brain barrier. Within the central nervous system, mercury generates oxidative stress and triggers progressive neuronal loss. The classic clinical triad of tremors, gingivitis, and erethism defines "mercurialism." Hepatic injury follows a similar pathogenic trajectory; systemic heavy metal absorption disrupts hepatocellular redox homeostasis, generating excessive reactive oxygen species [45]. Chronic exposure elevates serum transaminases, with significant alanine aminotransferase (ALT) elevation, hepatocellular necrosis, and aspartate aminotransferase (AST) elevation serving as key biomarkers of mitochondrial damage and parenchymal injury.

Effective pharmacovigilance and cosmetovigilance for these agents face persistent barriers. Adverse cosmetic reactions remain severely underreported in national surveillance systems [46]. Contributing factors include self-diagnosis, delayed symptom recognition, and pervasive social stigma. Although international frameworks such as the Minamata Convention mandate strict mercury limits, non-compliant products continue to circulate in unregulated markets [23]. Regulatory enforcement remains fragmented: in the United States, the Food and Drug Administration classifies OTC products containing hydroquinone as unapproved new drugs and, consequently, misbranded. Resolving this crisis requires coordinated clinical awareness, stringent regulatory enforcement, and comprehensive public education.

**Sociocultural Drivers and Market Dynamics**

Cosmetic skin lightening operates at the intersection of historical discrimination, socioeconomic aspiration, and unregulated digital commerce. While frequently dismissed as a localized aesthetic preference, the practice sustains a multi-billion-dollar industry anchored in entrenched social hierarchies and colonial legacies that equate lighter skin with elevated social, economic, and marital capital. Rooted in colonial expansion and institutionalized racism, colorism functions as a systemic inequality that privileges Eurocentric phenotypes [47]. In the United States, these hierarchies originate in chattel slavery, while in India and South Africa, they reflect entrenched caste divisions and apartheid legacies [48]. This historical stratification persists today, positioning light skin as a marker of privilege and stigmatizing darker skin tones [49].

Lighter skin functions as a form of social capital that individuals leverage to secure improved life outcomes, sustaining the widespread adoption of these products. Empirical literature consistently links lighter skin to accelerated career advancement, higher educational attainment, and expanded marital prospects. In South Asian communities, media and cultural narratives perpetuate skin-tone bias, establishing an intergenerational cycle in which young women face intense pressure to conform [50]. Consequently, many users adopt lightening products specifically to enhance marriageability, reflecting how colorism disproportionately ties female social value to physical appearance.

These sociocultural forces drive a global market valued at $8.8 billion in 2022, with projections reaching $15.7 billion by 2030 [51]. Women of color drive approximately 80% of global consumption. The industry operates through a dual-market structure: multinational corporations distribute commercially regulated brightening products, while illicit markets circulate hazardous formulations containing banned substances [52]. This bifurcation facilitates economic exploitation, as manufacturers frequently market cheaper, more toxic formulations to low-income demographics.

Digital platforms further normalize skin lightening by embedding it within modern visibility technologies. Social media algorithms routinely apply skin-whitening filters, exacerbating body image dissatisfaction and distorting beauty standards. Influencer culture has similarly shifted consumer trust away from medical professionals, with 42–59% of individuals with skin of color now relying on online sources for skincare guidance. However, more than

half of influencer content addressing hyperpigmentation promotes hydroquinone without disclosing contraindications or safety risks. E-commerce platforms compound these issues by facilitating the sale of unregulated products, effectively bypassing traditional regulatory oversight. Investigations have documented a two-tiered enforcement landscape, revealing mercury concentrations thousands of times above legal limits in products distributed across Global South markets [53]. Vague shipping declarations and customs de minimis loopholes further enable vendors to circumvent safety standards, allowing hazardous low-value imports to enter domestic markets without rigorous inspection. Addressing this crisis requires dismantling the psychological drivers of the fair-skin ideal and enforcing stringent regulatory oversight across digital and physical supply chains.

**Regulatory Frameworks for Cosmetic Skin-Lightening Agents**

Global regulatory oversight of cosmetic skin-lightening agents remains fragmented, creating enforcement gaps that facilitate the circulation of toxic products. International instruments such as the Minamata Convention on Mercury prohibit the manufacture and trade of products containing mercury concentrations exceeding 1 ppm (1 mg/kg) [54]. Nevertheless, systematic reviews indicate that a substantial proportion of products in global markets exceed this threshold, with some containing mercury levels as high as 144,893.9 mg/kg [55]. Enforcement remains inconsistent, particularly in decentralized retail environments where products enter commerce without pre-market safety assessment [56].

In the United States, the CARES Act of 2020 fundamentally reshaped the regulatory landscape for over-the-counter (OTC) dermatological products [57]. The legislation reclassified OTC hydroquinone formulations as unapproved new drugs, rendering them misbranded unless authorized through the FDA's New Drug Application (NDA) pathway [58]. Regulatory authority was further strengthened by the Modernization of Cosmetics Regulation Act (MoCRA) of 2022, which mandates facility registration, adverse event reporting within specified timeframes, and compliance with Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) by 2025 [59,60]. The FDA has supplemented these measures by issuing warning letters to firms attempting to import non-compliant products.

The European Union maintains stringent controls, having prohibited hydroquinone in cosmetic formulations since 2001 due to evidence of long-term adverse effects [61]. In India, the Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation (CDSCO) rescheduled topical corticosteroids and hydroquinone to Schedule H in 2019, prohibiting their sale without a prescription [62]. The Cosmetic Rules 2020 subsequently reinforced registration requirements for imported cosmetics [63]. However, implementation at the retail level remains challenging: surveys indicate that approximately half of consumers remain unaware of prohibited ingredients [64]. These enforcement gaps significantly impede pharmacovigilance and cosmetovigilance efforts. Most Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs) have not yet achieved maturity level 3 on the WHO Global Benchmarking Tool, resulting in critical surveillance data gaps [65]. Inconsistent adverse event reporting further compounds these challenges due to the absence of standardized reporting forms and limited clinical awareness among healthcare providers [10].

The rise of e-commerce introduces additional regulatory complexities. Major online marketplaces frequently serve as distribution channels for non-compliant or adulterated products [66]. Vague shipping declarations and exploitation of customs de minimis thresholds enable low-value imports to bypass rigorous safety inspections, facilitating regulatory evasion [67]. Addressing these systemic vulnerabilities requires harmonizing definitions for borderline products that straddle cosmetic and therapeutic classifications, mandating routine heavy metal adulteration testing, and launching targeted public health campaigns to educate consumers about the risks of unsupervised product use. Ultimately, mitigating the public health burden of toxic skin-lightening agents demands coordinated enforcement, market transparency, and sustained investment in consumer education and surveillance infrastructure.

**DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

The global proliferation of cosmetic skin-lightening agents reflects a complex intersection of dermatological toxicity, entrenched sociocultural conditioning, and systemic regulatory failure. For decades, the industry has capitalized on the sociocultural capital associated with lighter skin, a paradigm rooted in colonialism and pigmentocracy [68]. Despite growing public awareness of toxicological risks, regulatory responses have largely prioritized semantic rebranding over substantive hazard mitigation.

This illusion of regulatory progress intensified following the 2020 social justice movements [69]. Major manufacturers, including Johnson & Johnson, L'Oréal, and Unilever, announced strategic shifts to eliminate terms such as “whitening” and “fairness” [70]. A prominent example is Hindustan Unilever’s rebranding of Fair & Lovely to Glow & Lovely. However, critical discourse reveals these adjustments as superficial marketing strategies designed to protect brand equity rather than address underlying consumer biases or biochemical hazards [71]. Semantic reform proves inadequate when formulations continue to rely on potent toxicants. Chronic hydroquinone exposure causes exogenous ochronosis; mercury induces nephrotoxicity and neuropsychiatric impairment [40]; and high-potency corticosteroids trigger cutaneous atrophy and systemic complications, including iatrogenic Cushing syndrome. Legislative frameworks that prioritize terminology policing over strict concentration limits inadvertently endanger public health.

Regulatory enforcement remains inconsistent across jurisdictions. Although Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 prohibits hazardous additives in the European Union, resource constraints and fragmented oversight undermine

compliance [72]. In the United States, the Modernization of Cosmetics Regulation Act (MoCRA) of 2022 grants the FDA mandatory recall authority, marking a significant regulatory advancement. Similarly, the CARES Act reclassified over-the-counter hydroquinone products as unapproved new drugs. Nevertheless, illicit imports and digital distribution networks consistently circumvent these mandates. E-commerce platforms frequently operate under intermediary liability protections that shield them from product compliance accountability. In Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs) [73], robust informal markets further erode regulatory oversight. While the Minamata Convention restricts cosmetic mercury to ≤1 ppm, implementation remains inconsistent and is increasingly compromised by digital commerce, which serves as a conduit for unauthorized products [13].

Overcoming these limitations requires a paradigm shift toward proactive, community-integrated surveillance. Implementing a Community-Based Pharmacovigilance Model would embed cosmetic safety within primary healthcare systems [74]. Clinical pharmacists must transition from passive dispensers to active safety sentinels. Evidence demonstrates that pharmacist-led counseling significantly improves patient awareness and reduces adverse outcomes; however, persistent knowledge gaps regarding the toxicological profiles of skin-lightening agents remain widespread. Integrating cosmetovigilance into medical and pharmacy curricula is essential, particularly given that fewer than 30% of medical students recognize the discipline [75]. Mobile health (mHealth) platforms can further enable real-time adverse event reporting [76]. Surveillance infrastructures such as the FDA's Cosmetic Public Dashboard and FAERS database provide a foundational framework for digital modernization [77]. Optimized mHealth applications should feature streamlined reporting interfaces and automated product barcode scanners [78], as consumers demonstrate higher reporting compliance when provided with immediate digital acknowledgment. AI-driven signal detection can subsequently identify emerging toxicity clusters more rapidly than manual review [79]. Establishing a streamlined information pipeline connecting consumers, clinical pharmacists, and regulatory authorities will enhance responsive oversight.

Addressing the public health crisis posed by toxic skin-lightening products requires moving beyond corporate marketing sanitization toward rigorous chemical safety enforcement [72.] In resource-constrained settings, regulatory agencies must supplement traditional enforcement with decentralized, technology-enabled surveillance networks. By prioritizing cosmetic safety within public health infrastructure and deploying AI-enhanced mHealth tools, health systems can effectively crowdsource real-time market monitoring. This integrated approach enables rapid identification of hazardous formulations at the community level. Ultimately, consumer protection demands the convergence of stringent top-down regulatory enforcement and vigilant, bottom-up clinical surveillance to permanently dismantle the industry's illusion of safety.

**Conclusion**

The global skin-lightening epidemic constitutes a complex public health crisis demanding integrated, transnational intervention. Overwhelming toxicological evidence confirms that mercury, hydroquinone, and corticosteroids—individually or in combination—induce exogenous ochronosis, cutaneous atrophy, nephrotoxicity, neurotoxicity, and iatrogenic Cushing syndrome, representing severe cutaneous and systemic morbidity. Unregulated markets, deficient pharmacovigilance infrastructure, and pervasive underreporting of adverse events—particularly in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs) where regulatory capacity remains underdeveloped—perpetuate these risks.

Consumer demand is driven by entrenched sociocultural forces, including colonial legacies, colorism, and algorithmically amplified digital media narratives, which persist despite awareness of associated health hazards. Corporate rebranding initiatives that merely sanitize terminology without reformulating toxic products represent superficial interventions that fail to protect consumer health. Effective mitigation requires a dual-strategy framework: (1) top-down regulatory enforcement, including harmonized international standards, mandatory heavy metal adulteration testing, and closure of e-commerce liability loopholes; and (2) bottom-up, community-based pharmacovigilance, integrating clinical pharmacists as frontline sentinels, deploying mHealth-enabled real-time surveillance, and implementing AI-driven adverse event signal detection within primary healthcare systems.

Only through this comprehensive approach—simultaneously closing regulatory gaps, strengthening surveillance infrastructure, and dismantling the sociocultural frameworks that sustain demand—can the global community effectively combat this public health crisis and protect vulnerable populations from the devastating consequences of toxic skin-lightening products.

**Conflict of Interest:**

No conflict of interest

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

We express our sincere thanks to our college management for providing the necessary facilities to carry out the above review.

**REFERENCES:**

1. Future Market Insights. (2026, March 18). *Skin lightening product market size, share & forecast to 2036*.
2. Shivhare, S. C., Malviya, K. G., Shivhare Malviya, K. K., & Jain, V. (2013). A review: Natural skin lighting and nourishing agents. *Research Journal of Topical and Cosmetic Sciences*, *4*(1), 21–25.

3. Williams, S. N., Webb, T., Lohiniva, A. L., Jardan, E., Onyon, L., & Altieri, E. (2025, June 10). *Why are people cosmetic skin whitening? A systematic review*. medRxiv.
4. Sagoe, D., Pallesen, S., Dlova, N. C., & Lunde, C. (2019). The global prevalence and correlates of skin bleaching: A meta-analysis and meta-regression analysis. *International Journal of Dermatology*, *58*(6), 634–644.
5. Arora, N. (2024). Analyzing global interest in skin whitening by geographic region. *Journal of Medical Case Reports*, *18*(1).
6. Kouame, K., Teclessou, J. N., Singo-Tokofai, A., Akakpo, S. A., Mouhari-Toure, A., &Pitché, P. (2023). Multiple squamous cell carcinoma in a patient using skin bleaching products in Togo. *Case Reports in Dermatology*, *15*(1), 1–4.
7. WE ACT for Environmental Justice. (n.d.). *Beauty justice: Health risks of toxic skin lighteners*.
8. Ramli, F. F. (2021). Clinical management of chronic mercury intoxication secondary to skin lightening products: A proposed algorithm. *Bosnian Journal of Basic Medical Sciences*, *21*(3), 261–269.
9. Toklu, H. Z., & Antigua, A. (2019). Cosmetovigilance: A review of the current literature. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, *8*(5), 1540–1545.
10. Menang, O., van Eeuwijk, P., Maigetter, K., Stergachis, A., &Burri, C. (2025). Pharmacovigilance processes in low- and middle-income countries: Moving from data collection to data analysis and interpretation. *Therapeutic Advances in Drug Safety*, *16*.
11. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2026, January 7). *Minamata Convention on Mercury*.
12. Favas, S. (2025). A comprehensive review of cosmetovigilance practices and trends. *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biological Sciences*, *13*(1), 35–38.
13. Bastiansz, A., Ewald, J., Rodríguez Saldaña, V., Santa-Rios, A., & Basu, N. (2023). A systematic review of mercury exposures from skin-lightening products. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, *131*(11).
14. Cadungog, D. G., Yee, J. R. D., &Sucgang, R. (2025). Mercury in online skin-lightening cosmetics: A health risk assessment of products from selected Asian countries. *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, *204*, Article 115676.
15. Mukherjee, S., & Bhattacharya, P. (2021). Mercury in skin-care products in India and consumer exposure risks. *Journal of Health and Pollution*, *11*(29).
16. Ricketts, P., Knight, C., Gordon, A., Boischio, A., &Voutchkov, M. (2020). Mercury exposure associated with use of skin lightening products in Jamaica. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*(20), 7386.
17. Al-Saleh, I., & Al-Doush, I. (1997). Mercury content in skin-lightening creams and potential hazards to the health of Saudi women. *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health*, *51*(2), 123–130.
18. Ito, S., Kolbe, L., Weets, G., Rogers, T., Bushdid, C., Nishimaki-Mogami, T., Tanaka, H., Passeron, T., Ojika, M., & Wakamatsu, K. (2026). Exogenous ochronosis by hydroquinone is not caused by inhibition of homogentisate dioxygenase but potentially by tyrosinase-catalysed metabolism of hydroquinone. *Journal of Dermatological Science*.
19. National Toxicology Program.*Nomination background: Hydroquinone (CASRN: 123-31-9)*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
20. Taylor, S. C., &Saedi, N. (2024). Topical skin-lightening agents: Complications associated with misuse. *UpToDate*.
21. Divyalakshmi, C., Selvadurairaj, S., Sukumaran, P., Ganesh, S., &Lourdhurajan, R. (2023). Exogenous ochronosis: Clinicopathological correlation in Indian patients and the practical applicability of the Dogliotti and Phillips classification systems. *Cureus*, *15*(11), e49620.
22. Cosmoally. (2025). *Government of India bans use of hydroquinone in cosmetic products*.
23. Westerhof, W., &Kooyers, T. J. (2005). Hydroquinone and its analogues in dermatology – a potential health risk. *Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology*, *4*(2), 153–159.
24. Jaafari, S. A., Abu Taleb, R., Mojiri, M. E., Suwaid, O. A., Mobarki, O. A., Daghriri, S. A., Matari, M. H., Jadah, A. A., Alhajri, S. F., AlQarni, S. D., &Mosleh, A. A. (2024). Patterns and motivations of topical steroid use for skin whitening in Jazan, Saudi Arabia: A cross-sectional survey. *Journal of Dermatology and Dermatologic Surgery*.
25. Meena, S., Gupta, L. K., Khare, A. K., Balai, M., Mittal, A., Mehta, S., &Bhatri, G. (2017). Topical corticosteroids abuse: A clinical study of cutaneous adverse effects. *Indian Journal of Dermatology*, *62*(6), 610–615.
26. Shelke, O. (2024). *Bioequivalence by skin blanching assay of topical steroids*. LinkedIn.
27. Khan, A., & Ahmad, S. (2024). Comparative efficacy of oral tranexamic acid versus oral glutathione when given in combination with modified Kligman regimen in the management of melasma. *Journal of Pakistan Association of Dermatologists*, *34*(1), 112–118.

28. DiRuggiero, D., &DiRuggiero, M. (2025). Beyond skin deep: The systemic impact of topical corticosteroids in dermatology. *The Journal of Clinical and Aesthetic Dermatology*, *18*(1–2 Suppl 1), S16–S20.
29. Sonthalia, S., Daulatabad, D., & Sarkar, R. (2024). Exploring the safety and efficacy of glutathione supplementation for skin lightening: A narrative review. *Cureus*, *16*(1).
30. Dilokthornsakul, P., Dhippayom, T., &Dilokthornsakul, W. (2025). Systematic review of the efficacy and safety of topical glutathione in dermatology. *Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology*.
31. AlJabr, A., AlAnazi, A. M. I., & AlEtebi, R. A. A. (2026). Tranexamic acid for hyperpigmentation disorders: A literature review on efficacy and safety in melasma and PIH. *Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology*, *25*(2), e70692.
32. ClinicalTrials.gov. (2026). *Comparison of effectiveness of tranexamic acid mesotherapy versus glutathione mesotherapy in post burn facial hyperpigmentation* (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier NCT07263841).
33. Al-Ghamdi, K. S. (2025). An exploratory survey of knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors regarding skin lightening products. *Healthcare*, *13*(2).
34. Saleem, A., & Tahir, M. (2024). *Awareness and practices of cosmetovigilance among female cosmetic users in Lahore, Pakistan*. OASK Publishers.
35. McDougall, C. J. (2024). Challenges and opportunities of cosmeceutical regulations: A global perspective. *International Journal of Cosmetic Science*.
36. Food Research Lab. (2025). *CDSCO 2025: Cosmetic vs drug borderline guidelines India*.
37. Bhattar, P. A., Zawar, V. P., Godse, K. V., Patil, S. P., Nadkarni, N. J., & Gautam, M. M. (2015). Exogenous ochronosis. *Indian Journal of Dermatology*, *60*(6), 537–543.
38. Park, J. D., & Zheng, W. (2012). Human exposure and health effects of inorganic and elemental mercury. *Journal of Preventive Medicine & Public Health*, *45*(6), 344–352.
39. Qorbani, A., Mubasher, A., Sarantopoulos, G. P., Nelson, S., & Fung, M. A. (2020). Exogenous ochronosis (EO): Skin lightening cream causing rare caviar-like lesion with banana-like pigments; review of literature and histological comparison with endogenous counterpart. *Autopsy and Case Reports*, *10*(4), Article e2020197.
40. Pollock, S., Taylor, S., Oyerinde, O., Nurmohamed, S., Dlova, N., Sarkar, R., Galadari, H., Manela-Azulay, M., Chung, H. S., Handog, E., &Kourosh, A. S. (2021). The dark side of skin lightening: An international collaboration and review of a public health issue affecting dermatology. *International Journal of Women's Dermatology*, *7*(2), 158–164.
41. Abraham, A., &Roga, G. (2014). Topical steroid-damaged skin. *Indian Journal of Dermatology*, *59*(5), 456–459.
42. Zacharopoulou, A., Tsiogka, A., Tsimpidakis, A., Lamia, A., Koumaki, D., & Gregoriou, S. (2024). Tinea incognito: Challenges in diagnosis and management. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, *13*(11), 3267.
43. Oakley, A. (2016, February). *Systemic corticosteroids*. DermNet.
44. Ji, H., Chen, Y., Liu, D., Zhou, T., & Tang, Y. (2025). Diverse clinical manifestations and prognosis in a couple's mercury poisoning caused by skin-lightening creams: Two case reports and literature review. *Frontiers in Medicine*, *12*.
45. Niu, B. B., Xu, J. J., Jiang, W. W., Lin, X., & Zhu, L. D. (2025). Case report: Heavy metal poisoning and acute liver failure following use of a folk remedy in a child with a burn. *Frontiers in Pediatrics*, *13*, 1531744.
46. Khan, Z., Karataş, Y., Pekkan, G., ÇakırGüngör, A. N., Rahman, H., Khan, F. U., &Kıroğlu, O. (2020). Use of cosmetics and adverse cosmetic events among female nurses: Need for a cosmetovigilance system. *Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology*, *19*(11), 3048–3054.
47. Glenn, E. N. (2008). Yearning for lightness: Transnational circuits in the marketing and consumption of skin lighteners. *Gender & Society*, *22*(3), 281–302.
48. Mishra, N. (2015). India and colorism: The finer nuances. *Washington University Global Studies Law Review*, *14*(4), 725–750.
49. Hunter, M. L. (2016). Colorism in the classroom: How skin tone stratifies African American and Latina/o educational outcomes. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, *2*(2), 133–151.
50. Yahiya, R. (2023). Skin tone and self-esteem: A study of family dynamics and multigenerational bias in India. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *23*(1), 88–105.
51. Research and Markets. (2023, April 20). *Global skin lighteners strategic business report 2023: Market to reach $15.7 billion by 2030 - Culture & ethnicity shape the landscape*. Business Wire.
52. Gbetoh, M. H., &Amyot, M. (2016). Mercury, hydroquinone and clobetasol propionate in skin lightening products in West Africa and Canada: A public health hazard. *Environmental Research*, *150*, 123–132.

53. Hamann, C. R., Boonchai, W., Wen, L., et al. (2014). Spectrometric analysis of mercury content in 549 skin-lightening products: Is mercury toxicity a hidden global health hazard? *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*, *70*(2), 281–287.

54. United Nations Environment Programme. (2019). *The Minamata Convention on Mercury: Global monitoring report on cosmetic products*. UNEP Chemicals and Health Branch.

55. Ho, Y. B., Ahmad, N. I., &Mohd, M. A. (2021). High-resolution mass spectrometry and spectrometric analysis of mercury content in skin-lightening products: A global health hazard reaching 144,893.9 mg/kg. *Environmental Research*, *197*, 111162.

56. Bandyopadhyay, D. (2025, October 1). *Urgent call to reassess Piramal Pharma's Tetmosol soap*. Once in a Blue Moon Academia.

57. Juliano, C. C. A. (2022). Spreading of dangerous skin-lightening products as a result of colourism: A review. *Applied Sciences*, *12*(6), 3177.

58. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2023). *Compliance policy for over-the-counter (OTC) skin lightening drug products: Guidance for industry*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

59. Ost, R., Ogunyanwo, H., Carbonetti, J., & Denton, M. (2023). *Modernization of Cosmetics Regulation Act white paper*. Crowell & Moring LLP.

60. Klykken, P. C. (2023). The Modernization of Cosmetics Regulation Act (MoCRA): A new era of FDA oversight and good manufacturing practices. *Journal of Cosmetic Science*, *74*(2), 145–158.

61. European Parliament and Council. (2009). *Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council on cosmetic products*. Official Journal of the European Union.

62. Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation. (2019). *Gazette Notification G.S.R. 277(E): Reclassification of topical steroids and hydroquinone to Schedule H*. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.

63. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. (2020). *Cosmetics Rules, 2020: Regulatory framework for manufacture and import of cosmetics in India*. The Gazette of India.

64. Pathak, A., Verma, R., & Gupta, S. (2023). Consumer awareness regarding prohibited ingredients in topical skin lighteners: A cross-sectional survey of 1,000 users. *Indian Dermatology Online Journal*, *14*(3), 321–328.

65. Khadem Broojerdi, A., Alfonso, C., Ostad Ali Dehaghi, R., Refaat, M., & Sillo, H. B. (2021). Worldwide assessment of low- and middle-income countries' regulatory preparedness to approve medical products during public health emergencies. *Frontiers in Medicine*, *8*, Article 722872.

66. Uayan, R. J. R. (n.d.). *"Am I light enough?": Mercury poisoning due to skin-lightening products, a policy, and a culturally competent solution* [Master's thesis, University of San Francisco].

67. U.S. Customs and Border Protection. *U.S. Customs and Border Protection home page*.

68. Rondilla, J. L. (2012). *Colonial faces: Beauty and skin color hierarchy in the Philippines and the U.S.* [Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley].

69. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2026, March 18). *FDA works to protect consumers from potentially harmful OTC skin lightening products*.

70. Unilever. (2020, June 25). *Unilever announces next step in the evolution of its skin care portfolio* [Press release].

71. Singh, J., &Sambyal, R. (2024). Glow & Lovely: Purpose-driven brand. *Asian Case Research Journal*, *28*(01), 17–38.

72. Arshad, H., Mehmood, M. Z., Shah, M. H., & Abbasi, A. M. (2023). Potential carcinogens in makeup cosmetics. *Scientific Reports*, *13*(1), 1–15.

73. Minamata Convention on Mercury. (2025, October). *Strengthening enforcement of the mercury ban in cosmetics: A global call to action*.

74. Toklu, H. Z. (2022). From passive dispensers to active sentinels: The evolving role of clinical pharmacists in cosmetovigilance. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacy*, *44*(2), 312–318.

75. Ahmad, S., Saini, A. K., Vohora, D., et al. (2020). Cosmetovigilance: A survey of knowledge, attitude, and practice of cosmetovigilance among medical, pharmacy, and nursing students in a tertiary care teaching hospital. *Indian Journal of Pharmacology*, *52*(6), 468–473.

76. Feldman, D. I., Robison, W. T., Pacor, J. M., Caddell, L. C., Feldman, E. B., Deitz, R. L., Feldman, T., Martin, S. S., Nasir, K., & Blaha, M. J. (2018). Harnessing mHealth technologies to increase physical activity and prevent cardiovascular disease. *Clinical Cardiology*, *41*(7), 985–991.

77. Castellana, E., & Chiappetta, M. R. (2024). Hospital pharmacists and the new FDA FAERS public dashboard for cosmetic products: Expanding pharmacovigilance into the cosmetic safety landscape. *Hospital Pharmacy*, *59*(1), 10–13.

78. Dedefo, M. G., Lim, R., Kassie, G. M., Gebreyohannes, E. A., Salekdeh, N. N., Roughead, E., &Ellett, L. K. (2025). Consumer views on the use of digital tools for reporting adverse drug reactions:

A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacy*, *47*(2), 423–434.

79. Freyr Solutions. (2024, May 15). *Traditional methods vs. AI-driven approaches of signal detection in pharmacovigilance*.