New method to assess soft focus parameters on living skin: how does it compare to visual lay person rating of skin radiance?

**Introduction**

The purpose of this work was to develop a new method to measure soft focus properties of cosmetic products on living forearm skin as a screening method to select a candidate for a larger claim support study with the parameters skin radiance, attractiveness and skin evenness rated by lay persons and trained raters on standardized facial photographs. The results of the claim support study were expected to proof the success of the pre selection method.

**Material & Methods**

Screening Study on Volar Forearms

It was assumed that the soft focus on forearm skin (Figure 1 + 2) can be used to screen the best candidate for a larger study with facial application and assessment of facial radiance. We chose real in vivo skin on the arm, because it was assumed that it simulates facial skin better than any artificial material. However, the forearm partly lacks the inhomogeneity of the facial skin and contains almost no sebum.

Six cosmetic products containing ingredients declared to increase facial radiance were applied to different test areas on the outer forearms of six female subjects. Then the baseline assessments of soft focus properties were performed. A defined amount of test product was applied on each marked test area. After product application, assessments of soft focus properties were repeated. Due to the fact that gloss intensity on forearms is low compared to facial skin, in a second trial artificial sebum was applied before product application. The amount of superfluous sebum on the skin was in the range from 50 to 200 μg/cm² as measured by Sebumeter. Then the products were applied and soft focus parameters were assessed (These2 results of the soft focus screening are shown in Figure 3).

**Results**

The pre-selected cosmetic test product was evaluated for facial radiance, attractiveness, and evenness of the skin on standardized facial photographs (Figure 4) by a panel of 27 female stimulus persons. It was predicted that the use of lipstick would have no influence on the rating results, because due to the short time between photographs untreated and treated they would appear identical in the two images. By 11 subjects no lipstick was used, while a group of 16 subjects was photographed with lipsticks. A separate analysis of the two groups was performed to prove this assumption. One of four different nuances of the test product was chosen for each subject according to a good fit of the lightness of color to the skin type. After taking baseline photos, the test product was applied on the face of the stimulus persons by an experienced technician. Photographs were repeated after a two hours waiting time.

**Conclusion**

The evaluation of the gonioscopic screening method for a selection of facial products concerning claims as improved radiance, attractiveness and even skin tone was not successful, though it was performed on living forearm skin and not artificial targets. The reason might be that the skin on the forearm is too even and homogeneous. Only one aspect, the gloss reducing efficiency (achievement of a mat skin surface) could be assessed. However, forearm skin is already extremely matte and we had to apply artificial sebum to increase glossiness. We expected that the test products would reduce glossiness on the sebum treated skin with different performance, so that the results could be used to discriminate between products and select candidates for a larger study on facial radiance. The results did not meet with our expectations. The finally selected well performing test product surprisingly increased glossiness on the sebum treated forearm (Figure 3). It seems that the reduction of gloss is not of much importance for the performance of the test products. The covering power of the product and further specific pattern of the reflected light, which are not covered in the forearm experiments, might be of higher importance. Our selection of product candidates based on facial images was successful, though only a few stimulus persons had to be photographed. This method is subjective and relies on the quality of the expert raters, but as can be seen from the very homogeneous ratings of trained and laypersons, even the human eye of a layperson is able to very robustly assess the investigated beauty parameters from highly standardized pairs of photographs. Further the result was not disturbed even by the use of other cosmetics as lipsticks. We believe that a low number of stimulus persons and expert raters is sufficient to successfully preselect candidate products for claim support studies on facial radiance and other beauty parameters.