

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

A standard scoring method for measuring white cast of mineral sunscreens and improving user compliance across diverse skin tones

A validated white cast scoring method for mineral sunscreens

Alexandra M. Maldonado López^{1*}, Emily Gallagher¹, Aiden Curry¹, Kylie Q. Sahloff¹, and Ivan Domicio da Silva Souza^{1*}

¹ Good Molecules, LLC, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United States of America

* Corresponding author

E-mail: lab@goodmolecules.com (AMML and IDSS)

21 **Abstract**

22 Using broad-spectrum sunscreen is an effective practice for preventing skin cancers caused
23 by ultraviolet (UV) radiation. Mineral sunscreens containing zinc oxide (ZnO) and titanium
24 dioxide (TiO₂) as physical UV filters are suitable for individuals with sensitive skin or allergies to
25 chemical UV filters. Consumer compliance with sunscreen application depends largely on its
26 cosmetic elegance, especially regarding white cast. Despite this, there is no official method to
27 quantify white cast and help design sunscreens for diverse skin tones. To address this gap, we
28 developed validated white cast scoring protocols that combine 1) subjective consumer feedback
29 on formulations containing ZnO concentrations ranging from 0–30% with 2) objective L*
30 measurements (whiteness) determined after sunscreen application. Our findings demonstrate a
31 strong correlation between increasing ZnO percentages and higher L* values, resulting in a more
32 visible white cast. White cast scores for the ZnO formulations were substantially consistent across
33 both in vivo and in vitro methodologies, with higher ZnO concentrations producing unacceptable
34 levels of white cast. This study provides a white cast scoring system as a quantitative tool for
35 evaluating and refining mineral sunscreen formulations, contributing to the development of more
36 cosmetically elegant sunscreens suitable for a wide range of skin tones.

37 **Introduction**

38 Ultraviolet radiation (UVR) is the primary driver of several skin cancers [1]. Recent
39 estimates state that one in five Americans will develop skin cancer in their lifetime [2]. Broad-
40 spectrum sunscreen usage is an effective measure for preventing skin cancer [3]. Daily application
41 of broad-spectrum sunscreen protects the skin against ultraviolet A (UVA) and ultraviolet B

42 (UVB) when exposed to UVR [1]. Sunscreens are divided into two categories based on the
43 presence of their UVR filter actives: chemical (also known as organic) filters or physical (also
44 known as inorganic but commonly known as mineral) filters. Mineral sunscreens, which consist
45 of the two U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved physical filters, zinc oxide (ZnO)
46 and titanium dioxide (TiO₂), are safe and effective options for sun protection. ZnO and TiO₂ are
47 physical filters that scatter, reflect, and absorb UVR [4]. Some state that TiO₂ effectively absorbs
48 primarily UVB, while ZnO mainly absorbs UVA radiation, whereas combining both provides
49 broad UVA/UVB protection [5]. Notably, at higher concentrations (> 7%), ZnO alone can provide
50 broad-spectrum protection, as well as protection against long-wavelength UVA [6]. ZnO is a gentle
51 option for sunscreens, making it suitable for individuals with sensitive skin or allergies to UV
52 chemical filters.

53
54 One of the most desired properties consumers seek in sunscreen is its cosmetic elegance
55 for an aesthetically pleasing look (the way sunscreen has easy spreadability and is invisible when
56 applied to the skin). However, consumers tend to stray away from mineral sunscreens due to their
57 lack of cosmetic elegance since ZnO and TiO₂ leave a white residue on the skin, called white cast
58 [7]. White cast from mineral sunscreens often deters consumers, especially those with darker
59 complexions [8,9]. Dermatologists recommend applying sunscreen at 2 mg/cm² every two hours
60 to protect against the harmful UVR [9]. This amount of sunscreen needed for protection can cause
61 a substantial white cast, leading consumers to apply sunscreen incorrectly or even avoid
62 application, exposing them to higher skin cancer risk. As a result, when consumers are counseled
63 on sunscreen use, most of the recommended sunscreens contain chemical filters that are
64 transparent when applied [10,11]. On one hand, UV chemical filters were found to be harmful to

65 aquatic environments, causing coral bleaching and marine life toxicity [12–15]. Environmental
66 impacts have led to the banning of chemical filters in several territories to protect islands and
67 coastal environments [16]. On the other hand, dermatologists have expressed concerns that
68 ingredient restrictions might lead people to use sunscreens less frequently [16]. Understanding and
69 addressing these consumer and environmental concerns is essential to ensure satisfactory and
70 consistent use of sunscreens. For this reason, industries are designing cosmetically elegant “reef-
71 safe” sunscreens based on mineral ingredients such as ZnO [17].

72
73 ZnO and TiO₂ have been used in sunscreens since at least the 1940s [18], and their
74 development has been scrutinized over the years. ZnO and TiO₂ particles used in sunscreens form
75 aggregates that can agglomerate between 0.1–10.0 μm in size [19] through their innate chemical
76 and physical properties. The larger the agglomerate, the more direct impact on UVR absorption
77 and the resulting sun protection factor (SPF) value [20]. Also, the bigger the agglomerate, the more
78 obvious the white cast is [21] since more particles reflect and scatter wavelengths in the visible
79 light range, which the retina perceives as white [4]. Thus, since ZnO and TiO₂ particles form
80 aggregates and agglomerates in sunscreen formulations, it is known that increasing concentrations
81 of ZnO and TiO₂ particles in sunscreen formulations can lead to increased white cast [7]. ZnO and
82 TiO₂ aggregates clump together primarily during manufacturing, where aggregates are exposed to
83 heat and drying processes, forming the agglomerates, which result in a sunscreen that reflects more
84 visible light and leaves a white cast on the consumer [22]. A way to deagglomerate metal oxide
85 particles is via milling, ultrasonication, or functionalization, which leads to repulsion or reduced
86 attraction between agglomerates. Interventions in the formulation stage that directly correlate with
87 particle size and interparticle interactions can be done to reduce white cast. An example is to

88 implement nanoscale metal oxides [7]. Additionally, pre-prepared ZnO and TiO₂ dispersions have
89 been used to inhibit the formation of larger aggregates and agglomerates typically produced with
90 free-flowing powders [7,23].

91

92 Even though there is no official method to measure white cast objectively, quantitative
93 transparency measurements can be used to optimize formulation development. An example is
94 determining the size-dependent transparency of the metal oxides through the Lorenz–Mie–Debye
95 theory. This theory has been used to plot transparency versus the average particle diameter of TiO₂
96 to predict the aesthetic appeal of sunscreens that use nanoparticles in vitro [24]. Other work has
97 also been done to quantify white cast through a consistent and reproducible skin color evaluation
98 [25,26], which has been helpful for dermatology and cosmetic science research. This skin color
99 assessment in various skin types can be achieved with noninvasive devices through colorimetry
100 by analyzing the intensity of the reflected wavelength to deduce the color it is “seeing”.
101 Colorimeters are an objective color quantification tool that represents human color vision
102 developed under the standardization of the Commission Internationale de l'Eclairage (CIE), an
103 international authority on light and color [27]. Their color quantification can be represented under
104 many color systems. The 1976 CIEL*a*b* color system is widely used for more in-depth research.
105 It operates under the premise of opponent-process theory with a three-dimensional color space.
106 The L* axis is grayscale with 0 (black) to 100 (white) values, which correlates with an individual's
107 level of pigmentation. The a* is the red-green axis that correlates with erythema because a positive
108 a* describes red, while a negative a* describes green values. The b* correlates with pigmentation
109 and tanning. It is the yellow-blue axis, in which a positive b* is yellow and a negative b* value is
110 blue [28,29].

111
112 Relying on colorimetry to objectively measure white cast can be challenging to reproduce
113 because of the variability in the size distribution, particle shape, and density of the metal oxide
114 particles in sunscreens when spread on the skin, as well as the fact that white cast is perceived
115 subjectively differently across various skin tones. Because of the lack of practical and validated
116 methods for measuring white cast caused by mineral sunscreens in different skin tones, we have
117 created a procedure for determining and recording the white cast of mineral sunscreens containing
118 zinc oxide via CIEL*a*b* in vivo and in vitro, considering the volunteer's perception of white
119 cast. These methods are intended to optimize the development of mineral sunscreens by allowing
120 the selection of formulations with a reduced white cast at the early stages of the product
121 development cycle.

122

123 **Results**

124 **Model fit and method validation**

125 In vivo and in vitro experiments are essential when formulating mineral sunscreens.
126 Clinical studies evaluate the white cast produced by mineral sunscreens across different skin tones
127 before the product reaches the market. Meanwhile, in vitro testing offers a cost-effective method
128 for screening and selecting promising sunscreen formulations before clinical trials. Thus, we
129 wanted to establish protocols to reliably measure white cast in vivo and in vitro. The white cast
130 measurements in our protocols focus on the L* value of the CIEL*a*b* color system since its
131 linear values span from black to white. For the in vivo protocol, we compared test formulations

132 containing a range of ZnO (0-30%) on volunteers of different Individual Typology Angle (ITA°)
133 subtypes (S1 Fig). When relevant, we further divided the volunteers' ITA° subtypes into three skin
134 pigmentation categories: **light skin pigmentation** (n = 5, comprising Very Light and Light ITA°
135 subtypes), **medium skin pigmentation** (n = 3, comprising Intermediate and Tan ITA° subtypes),
136 and **dark skin pigmentation** (n = 5, the Brown ITA° subtype only). For the in vitro protocol, we
137 employed VITRO-SKIN over a dark or light background as the substrate for the sunscreen
138 application. The benchmark (BM) of 14.7% ZnO was not included in the model fit and validation
139 to prevent compounding effects due to being formulated differently than the 0-30% ZnO
140 formulations, such as having different sizes or shapes of the ZnO particles.

141
142 We performed linear regression analysis to investigate if the ZnO percentage explains the
143 L* variance in the test formulations by assessing the goodness of fit in vivo and in vitro. For the
144 analysis in vivo (Fig 1A-1D), when the measurements from all volunteers are grouped, the adjusted
145 R² of 0.261 indicates a poor fit, suggesting that the model explains only a portion of the variance
146 in L* values based on ZnO percentage. The model's performance improves when the data is
147 analyzed separately by skin pigmentation categories. The fit was moderate in volunteers with light
148 skin pigmentation, with ZnO percentage accounting for some of the variance in L* values. The
149 model showed a good fit for medium skin pigmentation, effectively capturing most of the variance
150 in L* and performing reliably. In the dark skin pigmentation category, the fit was particularly
151 strong, with the model explaining the majority of the variance in L*, reflecting a robust and highly
152 effective relationship between ZnO percentage and L*. Furthermore, the measurements on
153 VITRO-SKIN with a black background resulted in an adjusted R² of 0.722, reflecting a good fit

154 between ZnO percentage and L* values (Fig 1E). The VITRO-SKIN on a white background had
155 similar results (S2 Fig).

156

157 **Fig 1. L* value Increases with Increasing Zinc Oxide Percentage.** Adjusted R² was calculated to
158 indicate the goodness of fit. (A) All Volunteers' L* value measurements (n = 195) extend from 41 to 75.
159 (B) Light skin pigmentation volunteers' L* measurements (n = 75) range from 59 to 75. (C) The L* value
160 measurements of medium skin pigmentation volunteers (n = 45) span from 51 to 68. (D) Volunteers with
161 dark skin pigmentation have L* value measurements (n = 75) from 41 to 66. (E) VITRO-SKIN on black
162 background L* measurements range from 24 to 71 (n = 30).

163

164 To continue our validation, a Shapiro-Wilk test was conducted to evaluate the data
165 distribution before performing a correlation analysis between the L* values and ZnO percentages.
166 Since our in vivo data was normally distributed, we performed Pearson correlations to determine
167 the strength of the correlation between ZnO percentage and L* (Table 1). Interestingly, when the
168 volunteers' measurements were evaluated altogether, there was a moderate correlation between
169 ZnO percentage and L* value, $r = 0.520$ ($p < 0.001$). Then, we calculated the Pearson correlation
170 for the three skin pigmentation categories. Light, medium, and dark skin pigmentation volunteers
171 had an $r \geq 0.822$ ($p < 0.001$), indicating strong correlations between ZnO percentage and L* when
172 analyzed per skin pigmentation group. An increase in correlation (r-value) was observed with
173 higher skin pigmentation (a darker background for the white cast). For the in vitro measurements,
174 because they were not normally distributed, we performed a Spearman rho analysis (Table 1),
175 resulting in a strong correlation between the ZnO percentage and the L* values, $\rho \geq 0.938$ ($p <$
176 0.001).

177 **Table 1. Model Performance and Linearity Metrics In Vivo and In Vitro**

Parameter	All Volunteers	Light Skin Pigmentation	Medium Skin Pigmentation	Dark Skin Pigmentation	Black Acrylic	White Acrylic
Linearity Range (ZnO %)	0 - 30	0 - 30	0 - 30	0 - 30	0 - 30	0 - 30
Regression Equation	$y = 0.3910x + 55.11$	$y = 0.28x + 63.7$	$y = 0.357x + 55.9$	$y = 0.506x + 46.3$	$y = 1.27x + 36.6$	$y = 0.0922x + 87.2$
Slope \pm SD	0.3910 ± 0.04625	0.2801 ± 0.02270	0.3570 ± 0.03506	0.5057 ± 0.03311	1.274 ± 0.1458	0.09224 ± 0.008862
Intercept \pm SD (L*)	55.11 ± 0.7808	63.66 ± 0.3832	55.94 ± 0.5918	46.28 ± 0.5550	36.59 ± 2.461	87.22 ± 0.1496
Pearson ($p < 0.001$)	0.520	0.822	0.841	0.883		
Spearman rho ($p < 0.001$)					0.938	0.951
n	195	75	45	75	30	30

178

179 We wanted to ensure that the measurements made by the NYX Pro 2 Color Sensor
180 colorimeter were accurate and precise. In vivo, accuracy was calculated by comparing the L*
181 values of all ITA° subtypes present in the study (Very Light to Brown subtypes) to the mean values
182 of L* for ITA° subtypes previously published [25]. All accuracy (Table 2) was between 88-96%
183 of the reference values. Furthermore, precision calculations were made for all ITA° subtypes and
184 the three subsets of Light, Medium, and Dark skin pigmentation (Table 3 and S1 Table). The
185 Relative Standard Deviations (RSDs) of the L* before and after the sample application were <
186 10%. In vitro, accuracy was analyzed by measuring CIEL*a*b* of pure black and white standard
187 paints on VITRO-SKIN with a black background in comparison with CIEL*a*b* measurements
188 of theoretical pure black (L* = 0, a* = 0, b* = 0*) and theoretical pure white (L* = 100, a* = 0, b*
189 = 0). The accuracy of measuring black on a black acrylic background was 89%, while for white, it
190 was 93% (Table 2). We also calculated the inter- and intra-day precisions (Table 3 and
191 Supplemental Table 2) of our L* measurements on VITRO-SKIN with black acrylic as the
192 background, resulting in RSDs < 7% before and after the test formulation application. The same

193 measurements were taken and analyzed for VITRO-SKIN on a white background, yielding similar
 194 results (Tables 2 and 3 and S2 Table).

195 **Table 2. Accuracy of L* Measurements for the In Vivo and In Vitro Protocols**

	Factor	Accuracy (%) ^a
In vivo Results	Very Light Subtype ITA°	88.11 [81.60 - 94.62]
	Light Subtype ITA°	94.62 [92.20 - 97.04]
	Intermediate Subtype ITA°	94.99 [93.05 - 96.92]
	Tan Subtype ITA°	95.34 [93.74 - 96.95]
	Brown Subtype ITA°	95.52 [91.31 - 99.72]
In vitro Results	Black Paint on Black Acrylic	89.16 [87.80 - 90.52]
	White Paint on Black Acrylic	92.53 [86.98 - 98.07]
	Black Paint on White Acrylic	88.26 [86.39 - 90.14]
	White Paint on White Acrylic	90.39 [81.97 - 98.81]

^aResults are expressed in Mean [C.I. 95%]

196

197 **Table 3. Precision of L* Measurements for the In Vivo and In Vitro Protocols**

	Factor	% RSD ^a Before Sample Application	% RSD ^a After Sample Application
Inter-Day In Vivo	Very Light Subtype ITA°	0.57% ≤ RSD ≤ 1.48%	0.40% ≤ RSD ≤ 1.56%
	Light Subtype ITA°	2.41% ≤ RSD ≤ 4.31%	2.23% ≤ RSD ≤ 5.02%
	Intermediate Subtype ITA°	1.05% ≤ RSD ≤ 2.81%	1.37% ≤ RSD ≤ 5.31%
	Tan Subtype ITA°	0.73% ≤ RSD ≤ 2.80%	0.76% ≤ RSD ≤ 2.45%
	Brown Subtype ITA°	6.46% ≤ RSD ≤ 9.28%	3.51% ≤ RSD ≤ 8.55%
	Light Skin Pigmentation	2.2% ≤ RSD ≤ 3.87%	2.07% ≤ RSD ≤ 4.52%
	Medium Skin Pigmentation	4.18% ≤ RSD ≤ 5.66%	3.35% ≤ RSD ≤ 5.92%
	Dark Skin Pigmentation	6.46% ≤ RSD ≤ 9.28%	3.51% ≤ RSD ≤ 8.55%
Inter-Day In Vitro	Black Acrylic	3.20% ≤ RSD ≤ 6.41%	1.11% ≤ RSD ≤ 4.76%

Vitro	White Acrylic	0.39% ≤ RSD ≤ 0.73%	0.24% ≤ RSD ≤ 0.55%
Intra-Day In Vitro	Black Acrylic	0.71% ≤ RSD ≤ 4.30%	0.12% ≤ RSD ≤ 6.85%
	White Acrylic	0.08% ≤ RSD ≤ 1.15%	0.05% ≤ RSD ≤ 0.78%

^aAll RSDs were reportedly < 10%.

198

199 **L* measurements**

200 The in vivo study was carried out with a panel of thirteen (13) female volunteers, aged 20-
201 60 years, Fitzpatrick II-VI, with diverse ethnicities (including 31% Caucasians and 38% Black or
202 African Americans, S3 Table). We recruited volunteers based on their Fitzpatrick Skin Type but
203 analyzed the research based on the volunteers' ITA° subtypes (SI Fig). Photographs and
204 CIEL*a*b* measurements were taken of the volunteer's skin before and after each test formulation
205 application to observe how the skin color changed subjectively (Fig 2). To understand the color
206 variation, we converted the mean CIEL*a*b* measurements into Hexadecimal color codes (HEX)
207 for more convenient observation. In the representative pictures of each ITA° subtype (Fig 2B), we
208 noticed that in the Very Light, Light, and Intermediate ITA° subtypes, the 30% ZnO sample
209 exhibits a prominent white cast on their skin, while, in comparison, the 20% ZnO caused less white
210 cast. In the Tan and Brown ITA° subtypes, the 20% and 30% ZnO samples caused a more apparent
211 white cast, but the 10% ZnO also produced some white cast on their skin tones (Fig 2B). Observing
212 the HEX color values (Fig 2C) shows a grey gradient with the increase in ZnO percentage. The
213 grey gradient can be observed in the Very Light, Light, and Intermediate ITA° with the 20% and
214 30% ZnO samples, while it is more striking in the Tan and Brown ITA° subtypes, starting at the
215 10% ZnO (Fig 2C).

216

217 **Fig 2. White cast Visualization caused by Different Zinc Oxide Percentages in a Variety of**
218 **Skin Tones.** (A) Legend indicating which formulation was applied to each square on the volunteers'
219 forearms. (B) Representative images of how white cast caused by different zinc oxide percentages are
220 experienced by each ITA° subtype. (C) Average HEX skin color of each ITA° subtype before and after the
221 application of each test sample.

222

223 **Subjective white cast perception**

224 Apart from subjectively visualizing the white cast difference caused by each test
225 formulation, we quantified the whiteness change caused by each ZnO percentage (Fig 3). One-
226 way ANOVA was performed to determine the objective shift in whiteness (L^* value) caused by
227 ZnO percentage before and after the test formulation application. All volunteers had a significantly
228 different increase in L^* value after applying the 20% and 30% ZnO sunscreen formulations ($p <$
229 0.001 and < 0.0001 , respectively, Fig 3A). Since we observed subjectively that the formulations
230 do not cause the same white cast in different skin tones and the baseline of L^* of each subcategory
231 spans different L^* values [25], we decided to continue our analysis on the three skin pigmentation
232 categories: light, medium and dark. When this subdivision was analyzed, we noticed that the 20%
233 ZnO difference was more statistically significant ($p < 0.0001$) in all three skin pigmentation
234 categories, while the 30% ZnO maintained the same p-value (Figs 3B-D). Similar to the in vivo
235 study, we quantified the whiteness shift caused by each ZnO percentage on VITRO-SKIN with a
236 black acrylic sheet as the background (Fig 3E). A statistically significant difference between L^*
237 before and after the formulation applications was observed for 5-30% ZnO percentages, including
238 the BM, with a significance of < 0.0001 .

239

240 **Fig 3. L* value Increases after Application of Zinc Oxide Formulations.** In vivo: (A) 20% and
241 30% ZnO test formulations show statistically significant changes in L* values after their use in All
242 Volunteers ($p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.0001$, respectively, $n = 39$). (B-D) Light skin ($n = 15$), medium skin ($n =$
243 9) and dark skin pigmentation ($n = 15$) volunteers show statistically significant changes in L* value when
244 using 20% and 30% ZnO test formulations ($p < 0.0001$). (E) In vitro: 0% ZnO test formulation has a
245 statistically significant difference after its application ($p < 0.01$). Test formulations with ZnO percentages
246 ranging from 5-30% and the 14.7% benchmark (BM) show statistically significant changes in L* values
247 after their application ($p < 0.0001$). $n = 6$. Error bars are shown as mean \pm SEM.

248
249 A subjective questionnaire was administered to gauge the volunteers' opinions on white
250 cast, resulting in 85% expressing concerns about white cast on their skin when applying sunscreen.
251 Questions about the test formulations were also administered (Table 4). The volunteers ranked the
252 formulations on their forearms from least to most white cast. An Interclass Correlation Coefficient
253 (ICC) was calculated for their ranking to explore if there was consistency in how the volunteers
254 perceived white cast on their skin. Volunteers had difficulty discerning the white cast between the
255 5% ZnO and BM 14.7% ZnO formulations. Nonetheless, we obtained an ICC of 0.991 ($p < 0.001$)
256 with a 95% confidence interval between 0.975 and 0.999, indicating a remarkably high level of
257 ranking agreement amongst volunteers. This high level of agreement provides a foundation for the
258 subsequent questions. When asked about the maximum level of white cast they would accept on
259 their face in exchange for sun protection, 23% of volunteers preferred a sunscreen with 0% ZnO,
260 38% were comfortable with 5% ZnO or the BM sunscreen, 31% preferred 10% ZnO and only one
261 volunteer was willing to accept a 30% ZnO white cast. The preferences shifted when the same
262 question was asked regarding white cast on the body. Only one volunteer preferred 0% ZnO, 31%

263 were comfortable with 5% ZnO or the BM, 38% preferred 10% ZnO, and 23% were open to
 264 sunscreens with a 20% to 30% ZnO level of white cast.

265 **Table 4. White Cast Subjective Assessment**

Factor	n	%	
Are you concerned about white cast?	Strongly Agree	7	53.9
	Agree	4	30.8
	Disagree	2	15.4
	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
What level of white cast on the face are you willing to trade for sun protection (SPF)?	0% ZnO	3	23.1
	5% ZnO	3	23.1
	10% ZnO	4	30.8
	20% ZnO	0	0.0
	30% ZnO	1	7.7
	14.7% ZnO Benchmark	2	15.4
What level of white cast on the body are you willing to trade for sun protection (SPF)?	0% ZnO	1	7.7
	5% ZnO	1	7.7
	10% ZnO	5	38.5
	20% ZnO	1	7.7
	30% ZnO	2	15.4
	14.7% ZnO Benchmark	3	23.1
n = 13			

266

267 **White cast score**

268 There is currently no official method to quantify the amount of white cast caused by
 269 sunscreens. To address this gap in sunscreen formulation, we developed a white cast score

270 specifically for mineral sunscreens. The white cast score for each test formulation was calculated
271 according to the equation: $White\ Cast\ Score = \frac{L^*f - L^*i}{100 - L^*i}$ where $L^*f = L^*$ measurement after test
272 formulation application, and $L^*i = L^*$ measurement before test formulation application. The white
273 cast scores for each test formulation and protocol are presented in a graph along with their
274 interpretation (Fig 4).

275
276 **Fig 4. In vivo and in vitro White cast Scores.** Scores are categorized as "No White Cast", "Reasonable
277 White Cast", "Threshold White Cast" and "Unacceptable White Cast" based on a combination of L^* values
278 and volunteer feedback. (A) White cast scores determined for in vivo measurements. (B) White cast scores
279 determined for in vitro measurements. BM = benchmark. Error bars are shown as mean \pm SEM.

280
281 For in vivo (Fig 4A), the negative control test formulation with 0% ZnO showed no white
282 cast on any volunteer. The 5% ZnO test formulation produced a reasonable white cast in all
283 volunteers. The 10% ZnO and the BM (14.7% ZnO) formulations in the majority of skin tones fell
284 into the threshold white cast category, between reasonable and unacceptable white cast levels.
285 Finally, 20% and 30% ZnO formulations received an unacceptable white cast score for all
286 volunteers. For in vitro (Fig 4B), the 0-30% ZnO formulations essentially replicated the in vivo
287 scores. The BM sunscreen differed from the in vivo results by being classified as a reasonable
288 white cast in vitro.

289
290 We conducted Pearson correlation tests for in vivo (all volunteers, light, medium, and dark)
291 and in vitro white cast scores (Table 5). Subsequently, we verified whether the correlation
292 coefficients for each in vivo category differed significantly from the in vitro coefficient. Results

293 showed no significant differences between the correlation coefficients for any of the comparisons:
294 All volunteers vs. VITRO-SKIN on black background, Light skin-pigmented volunteers vs.
295 VITRO-SKIN on black background, Medium skin-pigmented volunteers vs. VITRO-SKIN on
296 black background, and Dark skin-pigmented volunteers vs. VITRO-SKIN on black background.

297 **Table 5. White Cast Scores for In Vivo and In Vitro Protocols Correlate Equivalently**

Comparison	Pearson Correlations ($p < 0.001$)	Fisher's Z Conversion	Z difference ^a
All Volunteers vs. Black Acrylic	0.904 vs. 0.774	1.494 vs. 1.030	1.315
Light Skin Pigmentation vs. Black Acrylic	0.884 vs. 0.774	1.394 vs. 1.030	0.946
Medium Skin Pigmentation vs. Black Acrylic	0.919 vs. 0.774	1.583 vs. 1.030	1.312
Dark Skin Pigmentation vs. Black Acrylic	0.928 vs. 0.774	1.644 vs. 1.030	1.520

^aZ differences < 1.96 are not statistically significant at the 0.05% level.

298

299 Discussion

300 To address the lack of a standardized method for quantifying white cast in sunscreen
301 formulation, we developed a validated protocol to measure the white cast caused by mineral
302 sunscreens both in vivo and in vitro using CIEL*a*b* measurements. In vivo, melanin content in
303 the epidermis correlates negatively with L* values. Therefore, individuals with lighter skin
304 pigmentation have a higher L* value and a higher ITA° color classification than individuals with
305 darker skin tone [27,30–32]. Recognizing this, we divided the volunteers into the light, medium,
306 and dark skin pigmentation categories due to the different baseline L* values for each ITA°
307 subtype. This categorization allowed us to better evaluate the performance of various sunscreen
308 formulations across diverse skin tones.

309

310 Formulations used for testing containing 20% and 30% ZnO caused significant white cast
311 visually and quantitatively in light, medium, and dark skin pigmentation categories. Interestingly,
312 the 10% ZnO test formulation exhibited white cast visually in photos of Tan and Brown subtypes
313 despite the absence of statistical significance in the L* shift. This observation positioned the 10%
314 ZnO test formulation within a critical range for white cast quantification. Additionally, the 5%
315 ZnO and BM test formulations are particularly intriguing, as there is no statistically significant
316 difference in the L* shift before and after their application, and regardless of skin tone, volunteers
317 could not visually distinguish between the 5% ZnO and BM formulations. This highlights the
318 complex interrelationship between measurable white cast and consumer perception. Notably, in
319 vitro measurements using VITRO-SKIN with black acrylic backgrounds detected significant L*
320 value changes across all ZnO concentrations, confirming its sensitivity and reliability.

321
322 To complement these objective white cast measurements obtained, we administered a
323 subjective questionnaire to volunteers to evaluate consumer preferences and needs regarding the
324 cosmetic elegance of sunscreens. Volunteers prefer formulations with minimal white cast on their
325 faces when choosing sunscreen, while they are more willing to tolerate white cast on their bodies
326 if the sunscreen provides effective sun protection. This difference in the preference for white cast
327 on the face versus the body can be due to aesthetics and cosmetic elegance. A volunteer expressed
328 this sentiment: “It [white cast by mineral sunscreens] does not bother me too bad on the rest of my
329 body, but it is quite obvious on my face”.

330
331 These insights, along with the L* value measurements, informed our development of a
332 white cast score with four categories: “no white cast”, “reasonable white cast”, “threshold white

333 cast”, and “unacceptable white cast”. The threshold white cast category is a borderline range that
334 falls between being reasonable (cosmetically acceptable) and unacceptable (not aesthetically
335 pleasing). Sunscreen formulations with a white cast score in this range function like an ambiguous
336 element that may be subjectively perceived as either reasonable or unacceptable, depending on
337 skin tone and individual preferences. Our analysis showed that the 0-30% ZnO test formulations
338 had consistent white cast scores in vivo and in vitro, with the higher ZnO percentages having
339 unacceptable white casts (20-30%). However, 5% ZnO and BM test formulations fall into different
340 scores (reasonable vs threshold white cast, respectively) in vivo, even though volunteers could not
341 visually distinguish between them. This highlights the discrepancy between objective
342 measurements and the consumer’s perception. Interestingly, the in vitro method proved more
343 effective in identifying the BM test formulation as having a reasonable white cast score, aligning
344 more closely with volunteer preferences in white cast on their skin. Moreover, no significant
345 difference between the direction of in vivo and in vitro white cast scores was observed, indicating
346 that the white cast scores for both protocols correlate equivalently. This emphasizes the in vitro
347 method as a reliable tool for predicting consumer perceptions when optimizing sunscreen
348 formulations.

349

350 We have developed a validated protocol for measuring and recording the white cast of
351 mineral sunscreens containing ZnO with all in vivo and in vitro L* achieving > 88% accuracy and
352 being satisfactorily precise, with an RSD of < 10%. This white cast measurement protocol can
353 assess white cast in vivo for a finished formulation or in vitro while formulating mineral sunscreens
354 containing ZnO, and potentially other white pigments, such as TiO₂. Implementing this protocol
355 requires consistent lighting and careful calibration of the colorimeter to ensure accurate results that

356 accommodate diverse skin types and ethnicities. Our study has provided valuable insights;
357 however, it is essential to note its limitations. When measuring the ZnO 0% test formulation with
358 black acrylic as background, statistically significant differences exist between the L* values when
359 comparing the before and after measurements ($p < 0.01$). This suggests that the other ingredients
360 in the sunscreen formulations, not UV filters, may also affect the L* values. Additionally, we used
361 one ZnO ingredient among the many types available for formulating. Different kinds of ZnO
362 particles produce different white casts due to the manufacturing process altering their shapes, sizes,
363 and transparency. For example, the BM ZnO sunscreen scored as threshold white cast in vivo but
364 as reasonable white cast in vitro. This discrepancy may be due to how the ingredients of the BM
365 formulation interact with the VITRO-SKIN model. Another limitation lies in our volunteer pool,
366 even though the in vivo study proved successful in measuring white cast in a wide range of skin
367 types in the ITA° objective color classification, we could not recruit volunteers with a Dark ITA°
368 subtype. This limitation originates from the historical inconsistency of the Fitzpatrick Skin Type
369 classification, which was originally developed for lighter skin tones. The Fitzpatrick scale relies
370 on subjective evaluations of hair and eye color alongside responses to ultraviolet radiation
371 exposure, making it less reliable for darker skin tones [33,34]. In contrast, ITA° offers an objective
372 and quantitative approach to skin color classification, making it more suitable for dermatological
373 and cosmetic research. For instance, while we did not classify any volunteer as a Fitzpatrick skin
374 type I, there is a Very Light ITA° subtype volunteer. The same is observed inversely; two
375 volunteers have a Fitzpatrick skin type of VI, but our analysis has no Dark ITA° subtype
376 volunteers.
377

378 In summary, our protocol demonstrates a clear correlation between the increase in white
379 cast and the ZnO percentage in sunscreen formulations across different skin tones. These findings
380 reinforce the objectivity of ITA° and support its continued use alongside CIEL*a*b*
381 measurements for more reliable assessments [28]. The key observation is that white cast manifests
382 differently depending on skin tone. This challenges the common assumption that only darker skin
383 tones struggle with white cast; white cast manifests differently across skin tones but can be equally
384 undesirable. The cosmetic industry must account for various skin tones when formulating mineral
385 sunscreens. While some sunscreens provide reasonable white casts that are acceptable and
386 aesthetically pleasing for certain skin tones, they often fail to achieve cosmetic elegance for others,
387 leading to a critical gap in inclusivity within sunscreen development. Understanding and
388 addressing the consumer's concerns about cosmetic elegance is essential to ensure satisfactory and
389 consistent use of sunscreens.

390

391 **Conclusion**

392 In this study, we have developed a validated procedure for measuring and recording the
393 white cast of mineral sunscreens containing ZnO in vivo and in vitro. This practical methodology,
394 which involves objectively quantifying the white cast through colorimetry analysis and
395 subjectively assessing it by photography and questionnaire, is designed to be easily applied in the
396 development of mineral sunscreens. This procedure intends to optimize product development,
397 allowing the early selection of formulations with a reduced white cast and enhanced cosmetic
398 elegance for an improved consumer experience and, hopefully, user compliance.

399

400 **Material and methods**

401 **Test material**

402 Preparations containing various percentages of zinc oxide (ZnO) were used for the studies
403 presented in this paper. Five test formulations containing 0.00%, 5.00%, 10.00%, 20.00%, or
404 30.00% ZnO were made in our laboratory (S4 Table). The ZnO used in these formulations is coated
405 with triethoxycaprylsilane, which has a particle size > 100 nm and was obtained from BASF
406 (Florham Park, New Jersey, USA). The FDA allows up to 25% ZnO for over-the-counter
407 sunscreen products for human use according to the Code of Federal Regulations: 21 CFR §352.10
408 (National Archives, 2024), but one of our formulations contained 30% ZnO. This was done
409 according to the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for
410 Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH) reportable ranges for common uses of analytical
411 procedures, which states that for an assay of a drug substance or a finished (drug) product, the
412 high-end of the reportable range is 120% of declared content or 120% of the upper specification
413 limit [36]. The five test formulations were sent to contract laboratories for analytical assay of their
414 ZnO percentage as determined by Inductively coupled plasma-optical emission spectroscopy (ICP-
415 OES), and each formulation was confirmed accurate to the theoretical target. The test formulations
416 were also sent for microbiological assay of total plate count, yeast and mold, coliforms, *E. coli*,
417 *Pseudomonas* spp., *S. aureus*, *Salmonella* spp., and *C. albicans* (USP 61 and USP 62). There was
418 no microbiological contamination present. Additionally, a primary dermal irritability 48-hour
419 patch test study was conducted with 65 volunteers, and the test formulations did not elicit irritation.
420 A commercially available Broad Spectrum SPF 30 with 14.7% ZnO and no other UV filter was
421 used as the benchmark (BM) sample for comparison (S5 Table). For the in vivo and in vitro studies

422 presented, each test formulation (a total of six) was applied at the clinically recommended dose of
423 2 mg/cm².

424

425 **Colorimetry**

426 The NIX Pro 2 Color Sensor (NixSensor, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada), along with the Nix Toolkit
427 App available for iPhone, was the colorimeter used in this study for both in vitro and in vivo
428 CIEL*a*b* measurements. The suitability of the NIX Pro 2 Color Sensor was checked daily before
429 any experiment by conducting triplicate color measurements on black and white acrylic sheets
430 (200 x 300 x 2 mm). The L*, a*, and b* relative standard deviations (RSD)
431 were expected to be ≤ 2.0%.

432

433 **In vitro protocol for white cast measurement**

434 Artificial skin (VITRO-SKIN) was cut into 6.0 x 6.0 cm square pieces and then hydrated according
435 to the manufacturer's instructions (IMS, Florida, USA) 16-24 hours before the experiment. Each
436 test formulation was applied to a distinct piece of VITRO-SKIN. The VITRO-SKIN was inserted
437 into a slide mount, and placed on top of a black acrylic sheet to produce a dark background before
438 taking baseline color measurements. Three CIEL*a*b* measurements were taken per VITRO-
439 SKIN at the top left, middle, and bottom right of the substrate (S3 Fig). Once the baseline
440 measurements were taken, 2 mg/cm² of the test samples were applied to their corresponding
441 VITRO-SKIN. Post-application measurements were taken after a 15-minute rest to mimic usual
442 sunscreen directions for human use. Once the sunscreens were set, three CIEL*a*b* measurements

443 per sample were taken, similar to the baseline measurements. Moreover, the same procedure was
444 performed with a white acrylic sheet as the background.

445

446 **In vivo protocol for white cast measurement**

447 This protocol was a closed-label, double-blind study investigating how much white cast different
448 ZnO formulations can cause in various skin types. Good Molecules, LLC, USA, sponsored and
449 conducted this study between September and October 2024. Recruitment of potential volunteers
450 was done between September 3rd, 2024 - October 1st, 2024, via email or text message by sending
451 a flyer with a description of the study, basic requirements, and contact information to apply for the
452 screening and subsequent participation in the study. The protocol complied with the guidelines of
453 the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the Allendale Investigational Review Board (Old
454 Lyme, CT, USA), which ensures that the study is conducted ethically and per regulatory
455 requirements (Study Number GMCS#1-2024 approved on August 29th, 2024). All volunteers
456 signed a written informed consent before initiating the study.

457

458 Healthy volunteers of legal age with a Fitzpatrick skin type between II and VI who were willing
459 to comply with the procedures, methods, evaluations, and test product usage described in the
460 written informed consent were included in the study. Volunteers were excluded if they had 1)
461 dermatological conditions in the arms, such as Vitiligo, Rosacea, and Contact dermatitis, due to
462 the potential interference with the study's measurements; 2) a history of melanoma or treated skin
463 cancer within the last five years due to the potential risk of skin damage; 3) tattoos, moles, or
464 birthmarks covering the majority of their forearms due to the potential difficulty in measuring the

465 white cast; 4) hairy forearms and an unwillingness to shave for the study due to the possible
466 interference with the study's measurements; and 5) a known allergy to any ingredient in the test
467 formulations to ensure the safety of the volunteers and the accuracy of the study's results.

468

469 Fourteen healthy adult volunteers started the study following the screening and recruitment
470 process. However, one volunteer was excluded from the data analysis due to an ingredient allergy
471 that prevented testing the benchmark sample and for not following the protocol. No other protocol
472 deviations occurred during or after the study. The volunteers arrived at the study site with bare
473 forearms, clean of skin care products, including sunscreen and moisturizers. Before measurements,
474 the volunteers were given 15 minutes to acclimate to the ambient conditions. The research staff
475 then cleaned the volunteers' forearms with saline wipes, where they fixed six 3.0 x 3.0 cm silicone
476 squares with hypoallergenic adhesive tape - one square per test formulation. Three baseline
477 CIEL*a*b* measurements were taken at the top left, middle, and bottom right inside each silicone
478 square, as per S3 Fig. The mean Individual Typology Angle (ITA°) was calculated from the
479 CIEL*a*b* baseline measurements to categorize the volunteers' skin color. The research staff then
480 applied 2 mg/cm² of each test formulation inside its respective silicone square (Fig 2A). After
481 application, a 15-minute rest period was observed to let the formulations set on their skin before
482 repeating CIEL*a*b* measurements.

483

484 Top-view photographs of the inner forearms were taken with an iPhone (X model) in a studio light
485 box before and after the test samples application, as shown in Figs 2A and 2B. The before and
486 after photographs comprised a color correction card (ColorChecker Classic by Calibrite LLC,
487 Wilmington, Delaware, USA), which was used later to white balance the images with the aid of a

488 photo-editing app (Snapseed by Google version 2.22, Mountain View, California, USA). During
489 the study, the volunteers also completed a subjective questionnaire designed to collect their
490 opinion on white cast and the test samples.

491

492 **Method Validation and Fit**

493 The following set of analytical tests was conducted to validate our protocols. Linearity, accuracy,
494 and precision for all CIEL*a*b* data were tested and calculated. For in vitro studies, we tested for
495 both intra- and inter-day precision to confirm the repeatability and reliability of our measurements
496 on different days with different staff. For in vivo studies, we tested only inter-day precision for the
497 convenience of the study volunteers. We then conducted a comprehensive range of statistical tests,
498 including the Shapiro-Wilk normality test, Pearson and Spearman Rho correlation, and Adjusted
499 R-squared, to ensure the fit of our analysis. We used SPSS Version 30.0.0 for these statistics (IBM,
500 Armonk, New York, USA). An 80-120% accuracy, a precision of < 10% RSD, and an adjusted R²
501 of > 0.650 were deemed acceptable for our studies.

502

503 **Statistical Analysis**

504 The following set of descriptive statistics were provided for age: mean, SD, minimum, and
505 maximum. Similarly, for gender, Fitzpatrick skin type, ethnicity and/or race, a detailed set of
506 descriptive statistics is presented, along with their frequency expressed as number and/or
507 percentage. Quantitative means and standard error of mean were calculated for the CIEL*a*b*
508 data. In this study, we developed a white cast score to quantify the amount of white cast caused by

509 sunscreens. For these white cast scores, the Zdifference (Zdiff) was calculated to determine
510 whether correlation coefficients are equivalent or statistically different. First, we converted a pair
511 of Pearson correlation coefficients into Fisher's Z-scores to make them uniformly distributed.
512 Then, we found the difference between these scores and adjusted for the variability in sample sizes
513 to account for uncertainty. A larger Zdiff indicates a greater difference between the correlations
514 when comparing this value to the critical threshold of $Z = 1.96$ (for 95% confidence). Apart from
515 the statistical tests done for analytical validation, intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) estimates
516 and their 95% confident intervals were calculated using SPSS Version 30.0.0 (IBM, Armonk, New
517 York, USA) based on an absolute-agreement, 2-way mixed-effects model. Graphs with mean,
518 SEM, and two-way ANOVAs were done using PRISM 10 (GraphPad, Boston, Massachusetts,
519 USA). We used R Studio Version 2024.09 (Posit PBC, Boston, Massachusetts, USA) and the
520 RStudio package ggplot2, a powerful and widely used data visualization package in R, to generate
521 the ITA^o graph.

522

523 **Acknowledgments**

524 The authors thank all volunteers for their participation in the study. We also thank the teams
525 at Certified Laboratories and Kosmoscience for their support with microbiological, analytical, and
526 clinical tolerance studies.

527

528 **References**

529 1. Guan LL, Lim HW, Mohammad TF. Sunscreens and Photoaging: A Review of Current

- 530 Literature. *Am J Clin Dermatol*. 2021 Nov;22(6):819–28.
- 531 2. Guy GP, Machlin SR, Ekwueme DU, Yabroff KR. Prevalence and Costs
532 of Skin Cancer Treatment in the U.S., 2002–2006 and 2007–2011. *Am J*
533 *Prev Med*. 2015 Feb;48(2):183–7.
- 534 3. Hughes MCB, Williams GM, Baker P, Green AC. Sunscreen and Prevention of Skin Aging:
535 A Randomized Trial. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013 Jun 4;158(11):781.
- 536 4. Cole C, Shyr T, Ou-Yang H. Metal oxide sunscreens protect skin by absorption, not by
537 reflection or scattering. *Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed*. 2016 Jan;32(1):5–10.
- 538 5. Serpone N. Sunscreens and their usefulness: have we made any progress in the last two
539 decades? *Photochem Photobiol Sci*. 2021 Feb;20(2):189–244.
- 540 6. Ezekwe N, Pourang A, Lyons AB, Narla S, Atyam A, Zia S, et al. Evaluation of the
541 protection of sunscreen products against long wavelength ultraviolet A1 and visible light-
542 induced biological effects. *Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed*. 2024 Jan;40(1):e12937.
- 543 7. Addae AJ, Weiss PS. Standardizing the White Cast Potential of Sunscreens with Metal
544 Oxide Ultraviolet Filters. *Acc Mater Res*. 2024 Apr 26;5(4):392–9.
- 545 8. Xiong M, Warshaw EM. Popular sunscreens marketed to individuals with skin of color:
546 Cost, marketing claims, and allergenic ingredients. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2023
547 Apr;88(4):939–41.
- 548 9. Xu S, Kwa M, Agarwal A, Rademaker A, Kundu RV. Sunscreen Product Performance and
549 Other Determinants of Consumer Preferences. *JAMA Dermatol*. 2016 Aug 1;152(8):920.
- 550 10. Akamine KL, Gustafson CJ, Davis SA, Levender MM, Feldman SR. Trends in Sunscreen
551 Recommendation Among US Physicians. *JAMA Dermatol*. 2014 Jan 1;150(1):51.
- 552 11. Song H, Beckles A, Salian P, Porter ML. Sunscreen recommendations for patients with skin

- 553 of color in the popular press and in the dermatology clinic. *Int J Womens Dermatol*. 2021
554 Mar;7(2):165–70.
- 555 12. Danovaro R, Bongiorno L, Corinaldesi C, Giovannelli D, Damiani E, Astolfi P, et al.
556 Sunscreens Cause Coral Bleaching by Promoting Viral Infections. *Environ Health Perspect*.
557 2008 Apr;116(4):441–7.
- 558 13. Schneider SL, Lim HW. Review of environmental effects of oxybenzone and other
559 sunscreen active ingredients. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2019 Jan;80(1):266–71.
- 560 14. Barone AN, Hayes CE, Kerr JJ, Lee RC, Flaherty DB. Acute toxicity testing of TiO₂-based
561 vs. oxybenzone-based sunscreens on clownfish (*Amphiprion ocellaris*). *Environ Sci Pollut*
562 *Res*. 2019 May;26(14):14513–20.
- 563 15. Cocci P, Mosconi G, Palermo FA. Sunscreen active ingredients in loggerhead turtles (*Caretta*
564 *caretta*) and their relation to molecular markers of inflammation, oxidative stress and
565 hormonal activity in wild populations. *Mar Pollut Bull*. 2020 Apr;153:111012.
- 566 16. Levine A. Reducing the prevalence of chemical UV filters from sunscreen in aquatic
567 environments: Regulatory, public awareness, and other considerations. *Integr Environ Assess*
568 *Manag*. 2021 Sep;17(5):982–8.
- 569 17. Battistin M, Pascalicchio P, Tabaro B, Hasa D, Bonetto A, Manfredini S, et al. A Safe-by-
570 Design Approach to “Reef Safe” Sunscreens Based on ZnO and Organic UV Filters.
571 *Antioxidants*. 2022 Nov 9;11(11):2209.
- 572 18. Luckiesh M. Protective skin coating for the prevention of sunburn. *J Am Med Assoc*. 1946
573 Jan 5;130(1):1.
- 574 19. Smijs T, Pavel. Titanium dioxide and zinc oxide nanoparticles in sunscreens: focus on their
575 safety and effectiveness. *Nanotechnol Sci Appl*. 2011 Oct;95.

- 576 20. Singh P, Nanda A. Enhanced sun protection of nano-sized metal oxide particles over
577 conventional metal oxide particles: An *in vitro* comparative study. *Int J Cosmet Sci*. 2014
578 Jun;36(3):273–83.
- 579 21. Mitchnick MA, Fairhurst D, Pinnell SR. Microfine zinc oxide (Z-Cote) as a photostable
580 UVA/UVB sunblock agent. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 1999 Jan;40(1):85–90.
- 581 22. Schneider SL, Lim HW. A review of inorganic UV filters zinc oxide and titanium dioxide.
582 *Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed*. 2019 Nov;35(6):442–6.
- 583 23. Xu L, Zhou Y, Amin S. Chapter 13. Polymer Colloids for Cosmetics and Personal Care. In:
584 Priestley R, Prud'homme R, editors. *Soft Matter Series*. Cambridge: Royal Society of
585 Chemistry; 2019. p. 399–417. Available from:
586 <https://books.rsc.org/books/monograph/800/chapter-abstract/537275/>
- 587 24. Barnard AS. One-to-one comparison of sunscreen efficacy, aesthetics and potential
588 nanotoxicity. *Nat Nanotechnol*. 2010 Apr;5(4):271–4.
- 589 25. Ly BCK, Dyer EB, Feig JL, Chien AL, Del Bino S. Research Techniques Made Simple:
590 Cutaneous Colorimetry: A Reliable Technique for Objective Skin Color Measurement. *J*
591 *Invest Dermatol*. 2020 Jan;140(1):3-12.e1.
- 592 26. Richer V, Kharazmi P, Lee TK, Kalia S, Lui H. Quantifying the visual appearance of
593 sunscreens applied to the skin using indirect computer image colorimetry. *Photodermatol*
594 *Photoimmunol Photomed*. 2018 Mar;34(2):130–6.
- 595 27. Hasnul Hadi MH, Ker PJ, Thiviyanathan VA, Tang SGH, Leong YS, Lee HJ, et al. The
596 Amber-Colored Liquid: A Review on the Color Standards, Methods of Detection, Issues and
597 Recommendations. *Sensors*. 2021 Oct 16;21(20):6866.
- 598 28. Del Bino S, Bernerd F. Variations in skin colour and the biological consequences of

- 599 ultraviolet radiation exposure. *Br J Dermatol.* 2013 Oct;169:33–40.
- 600 29. Everett JS, Budescu M, Sommers MS. Making Sense of Skin Color in Clinical Care. *Clin*
601 *Nurs Res.* 2012 Nov;21(4):495–516.
- 602 30. Del Bino S, Ito S, Sok J, Nakanishi Y, Bastien P, Wakamatsu K, et al. Chemical analysis of
603 constitutive pigmentation of human epidermis reveals constant eumelanin to pheomelanin
604 ratio. *Pigment Cell Melanoma Res.* 2015 Nov;28(6):707–17.
- 605 31. Wu Y, Tanaka T, Akimoto M. Utilization of Individual Typology Angle (ITA) and Hue
606 Angle in the Measurement of Skin Color on Images. *Bioimaging Society*; 2020. Available
607 from: <https://doi.org/10.11169/bioimages.28.1>
- 608 32. Ibraheem NA, Hasan MM, Khan RZ, Mishra PK. Understanding color models: a review.
609 *ARPN Journal of science and technology.* 2012;2(3):265–75.
- 610 33. Fitzpatrick TB. The validity and practicality of sun-reactive skin types I through VI. *Arch*
611 *Dermatol.* 1988 Jun;124(6):869–71.
- 612 34. Ware OR, Dawson JE, Shinohara MM, Taylor SC. Racial limitations of fitzpatrick skin type.
613 *Cutis.* 2020 Feb;105(2):77–80.
- 614 35. National Archives. 21 CFR 352.10 Sunscreen active ingredients. In: *Code of Federal*
615 *Regulations.* Available from: [https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-D/part-352/subpart-B/section-352.10)
616 [D/part-352/subpart-B/section-352.10](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-D/part-352/subpart-B/section-352.10)
- 617 36. US FDA. Q2(R2) Validation of Analytical Procedures Guidance for Industry. Available
618 from: [https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/q2r2-](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/q2r2-validation-analytical-procedures)
619 [validation-analytical-procedures](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/q2r2-validation-analytical-procedures)
- 620

621 **Supporting Information**

622 **S1 Fig. Individual Typology Angle Subtypes of Volunteers.** A total of thirteen (13) volunteers
623 completed the study. The ITA°s range from Very Light to Brown subtypes.

624
625 **S2 Fig. In vitro Method of VITRO-SKIN over White Background is Less Sensitive to L*
626 value Changes caused by Zinc Oxide Formulations.** (A) Only test formulations with ZnO
627 percentages ranging from 10 - 30% show statistically significant changes in L* values after their application
628 ($p < 0.0001$) $n = 6$. (B) Adjusted R^2 was calculated to indicate the goodness of fit. VITRO-SKIN on white
629 acrylic's L* measurements ($n = 30$) ranged from 86 to 90. (C) Same graph as (b) but zoomed-in to observe
630 L* value measurements clearly. BM = benchmark; ns = not significant. Error bars are shown as mean \pm
631 SEM.

632
633 **S3 Fig. Materials and methods for taking CIEL*a*b* measurements.** (A) Representative
634 drawing of the in vitro model. The black rectangle is the black acrylic that serves as background. The gray
635 square is the 6.0 x 6.0 cm VITRO-SKIN inserted into the slide mount (white outline). (B) Areas where
636 CIEL*a*b* measurements were taken on VITRO-SKIN for the in vitro protocol and inside the silicone
637 squares for the in vivo protocol. (C) Image of the NIX Pro 2 Color Sensor and App from the vendor's
638 website: <https://www.nixsensor.com/product/nix-pro-color-sensor/>.

639
640 **S1 Table. Inter-day Precision of In Vivo L* Measurements by Zinc Oxide Percentage.**

641
642 **S2 Table. Inter- and Intra-Day Precision of In Vitro L* Measurements by Zinc Oxide
643 Percentage.**

644

645 **S3 Table. Demographics of the 13 Volunteers who Completed the In Vivo Protocol.**

646

647 **S4 Table. Laboratory Zinc Oxide Test Sample Formulations.**

648

649 **S5 Table. Commercially available Broad Spectrum SPF 30 with 14.7% ZnO.**




Fig 1





Fig 3

(A)

In vivo White Cast Score




- All Volunteers (n = 39)
- Light Skin Pigmentation (n = 15)
- Medium Skin Pigmentation (n = 9)
- Dark Skin Pigmentation (n = 15)

White Cast Score	Interpretation
> 0.05	Unacceptable White Cast
(0.010; 0.05]	Threshold White Cast
[- 0.025; 0.010]	Reasonable White Cast
< - 0.025	No White Cast

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.12.25322144>; this version posted February 13, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

(B)

In vitro White Cast Score



- Black Acrylic (n = 6)

White Cast Score	Interpretation
> 0.495	Unacceptable White Cast
(0.365; 0.495]	Threshold White Cast
(0.055; 0.365]	Reasonable White Cast
[0; 0.055]	No White Cast

Fig 4




Fig 2