

Skin Microbiome Biodiversity of Healthy Western Humans: A New Benchmark and the Effect of Age and Sex

Christopher Wallen-Russell^{1,2} and Sam Wallen-Russell^{1,3}

¹ Research Centre, Pavane Consultants Ltd., Suite 665, 105 London Street, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 4QD, United Kingdom

² Information Services, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK

³ Information Services, University of Notre Dame, IN 46556, United States

Corresponding Author:

Christopher Wallen-Russell¹

Carnarvon Road, Reading, RG1 5SBS, UK

Email address: kit@pavane.co.uk

Abstract

A catastrophic loss of microbial biodiversity on the skin has led to alarming increase in the prevalence of allergies and long-term damage to the skin, which could also have damaging knock on effects to overall health. This study uses 50 human participants, to obtain an average (benchmark) value for the biodiversity of 'healthy' western skin, which is crucial in updating our 2017 skin health measuring mechanism to use standardised methodology. Previous work with a larger sample size was unsatisfactory for use as a benchmark due to its use of different and outdated diversity indices. We also investigated the effect of age and sex, two known skin microbiome affecting factors. Although no statistical significance is seen for age- and sex-related changes in diversity, there appear to be changes related to age which elaborates on previous work which used larger, more general age ranges. Our study indicates adults age 28-37 have highest diversity, and age 48-57 the lowest. Crucially, because of this study we are now able to update the skin health measuring mechanism from our 2017 work. This will aid diagnostic assessment of susceptibility to cutaneous conditions or diseases, and treatment. Testing any human subject will be rapidly improved by obtaining future benchmark diversity values for any age, sex, body site and area of residence, to which they can be compared. This improvement means we can also more accurately investigate the ultimate question: What factors in the western world are a main cause of the skin allergy epidemic? This could lead to future restriction of certain synthetic chemicals or products found to be particularly harmful to the skin.

Keywords: skin microbiome; skin microbiome biodiversity; biodiversity; skin ecosystem; skin allergy epidemic; benchmark skin health values; skin bacteria; 21st century skin ailments; measure skin health; healthy skin ecosystem; healthy skin bacteria; damaged skin bacteria;

Introduction

For the c. 300,000 years that homo-sapiens have inhabited the earth [1] our bodies have been host to trillions of microorganisms and recent estimates have suggested that, by cell count, we may be more microbe than human [2]. On the skin the majority of these are beneficial or harmless [3–7] and vital for defending us against infections and disease [8,9,18,10–17], immune system regulation and lipid metabolism [19]. The skin is like any other ecosystem across nature: if healthy, the organisms (microbes) within it live in peaceful mutual symbiosis with the host [5,20,21], existing commensally or symbiotically the majority of the time, and only rarely becoming pathogenic when the ecosystem balance is disturbed. Our skin microbiome is made up of viruses, fungi, archaea and bacteria but it is the latter we focus on in this study.

So, what does a healthy microbiome look like? This is complicated by large intrapersonal and interpersonal variation, where every human has a unique ecosystem of microbes inhabiting their body [4,22,23]. As discussed in our previous work [24], changes in skin microbial abundances have been associated with disease states, including acne [25] and psoriasis [26]. However, despite attempts at finding definitive biomarkers for skin health using species or clades, and years of research, we are still very far off [7,27–29], and due to the very nature and complexity of ecosystems which operate using non-linear physics principles, it may not be unreasonable to suggest it could be an academic dead-end for at least the near future. Conversely, biodiversity as a biomarker for healthy or damaged skin is far more conclusive, which led us to our 2017 discovery of what was called ‘the first clear mechanism for measuring skin health’ [30]. We noticed the same phenomenon that occurred across nature, was no different on the skin: an increase in biodiversity equated to a healthier ecosystem [31–36]. Therefore damaged or diseased skin displays a reduced diversity when compared to healthy skin on the same subject and same area of the body [29,37–42], and studies have observed that with higher bacterial diversity, the immune system works more effectively to protect us [10,11,43]. Dysbiosis and decreased skin microbiome biodiversity has been linked with the majority of skin ailments, including eczema [44], psoriasis [45], dermatitis [29], skin cancer [46], and many more [40,42,47–54], but more work would need to be done to properly determine if low skin biodiversity is a cause or a symptom. It is for the above reasons that we focus solely on diversity in this paper, and not analyses of community structure.

Previous work found the highest microbial diversity ever recorded on humans from communities with little or no contact to western civilisation; healthy western humans, in comparison, displayed far lower diversity [38–40]. Western subjects with skin ailments were even further diminished [27,29,41,55–57]. As a result, there has been a rapid increase in skin related problems and allergies in the western world in the last 75 years, labeled a ‘skin allergy epidemic’. Many serious and life-threatening health problems in society have been eliminated by the introduction of 20th century chemicals, drugs, and western, predominantly indoor lifestyle.

But along with that has come a whole host of new problems, because our bodies are being exposed to practices which our ancestors, who can be traced back 6 million years [58,59], or even further back with mammalian evolution [60,61], never experienced or evolved to cope with.

In this study, we collected volar forearm swab samples from 50 human subjects with ‘healthy’ skin (absence of skin ailments) and analysed their bacterial microbiomes using 16S rRNA sequencing. Firstly, we wanted to establish a benchmark value of diversity for healthy western skin using primarily Chao1 diversity. We note that although previous work, such as The Human Microbiome Project with 242 human subjects (<https://hmpdacc.org/hmp/>) [62], used larger sample sizes, different methodology meant alpha diversity analysis did not include the Chao1 index [38,48] rendering them unsatisfactory as a benchmark and incompatible with our research. Therefore, this study uses the largest sample size for Chao1 biodiversity analysis. It is crucial to mention that we are strict on using Chao1 because it offers the most complete evaluation of diversity of an ecosystem. Other methods, such as the entropy-based Shannon and Simpson [63] metrics, can lead researchers to misinterpret the diversity of ecosystems. The former doesn’t account for the fact that some microbes will be rarer than others; and the latter gives too much weight to common or dominant organisms, meaning the presence of rare types with only a few representatives will not affect diversity. Chao1 is the other end of the spectrum and uses the existence of fragile ‘rare’ species as a sign that biodiversity is high. This concept is backed up in other areas of ecology, where it is common knowledge that rare species become extinct first as ecosystems are disrupted, weakened and lowered in biodiversity [64,65].

The main reason for this study, however, was to give us the ability to transfer the remaining benchmarks from our 2017 work, such as ‘Unhealthy Western Skin’ or ‘Perfect Skin’, to the current skin health measuring mechanism which uses updated standardised methodology. Secondly, we acknowledge that the microbiome has been found to change with factors such as age and sex, therefore we investigate how they affect bacterial diversity. This is critical to improving our skin health measuring mechanism for use on any human subject regardless of age or sex, and to aid studies testing what environmental factors are causing of long-term damage to the skin.

Materials & Methods

Study conditions and sampling procedure

A total of 50 human subjects in five different age groups were recruited from the town of Graz in Austria, and split into 5 groups:

- Group 1: 18-27 years
- Group 2: 28-37 years
- Group 3: 38-47 years
- Group 4: 48-57 years
- Group 5: 58-70 years

There were five female and five male study subjects in each group, meaning overall there were 25 females and 25 males. All participants were recruited on the criteria they were without chronic skin diseases (no serious skin conditions such as acne, eczema, psoriasis and skin cancer among others) and had not used antibiotics within the last three months. All participants did not shower on the day of sampling and all of them had their skin sampled once.

The skin microbiome samples were taken from the volar forearm of the non-dominant arm, with sterile BBL™ CultureSwab™ EZ (Becton Dickinson), which were pre-moistened with sampling buffer (50mM Tris (pH 7.2), 1mM EDTA, 0.5% Tween20). The swab was placed on the forearm and the whole area was swabbed with pressure under rotation in three directions (horizontal, vertical and diagonal). After sampling the swabs were directly transferred into DNA-free 1.5ml reaction tubes (Eppendorf AG) and stored at -80°C till further processing. Swabbing the skin has widely been used as a suitable sampling method when analysing the skin microbiome [7]. Sampling buffer controls were taken to control the sterility of the used buffer. We also used negative controls, including PCR and sequencing controls, DNA extraction controls and swab controls to exclude the effect of possible contamination from laboratory reagents.

The entire project was carried out in collaboration with The Medical University of Graz in Austria, and run independently, supervised by Kaisa Koskinen at the Department of Internal Medicine. All study participants were recruited by The Medical University of Graz. Human skin samples were taken non-invasively and handled with approval by and in accordance with the Ethic Commission at the Medical University of Graz. This study was approved by the Ethic Commission at the Medical University of Graz (*Ethikkommission der Medizinischen Universität Graz*: approval number EK – 31-110ex18/19). Approval allowed the use of human subjects and the following procedures in this methodology. All participants provided written informed consent prior to enrolment in this study. Samples were treated anonymously, and human material was not the focus point of this study. Microbial samples or data derived cannot be linked to a certain individual. The process of the experimentation was agreed upon by The Medical University of Graz, and ACIB (The Austrian Centre of Biotechnology), a not-for-profit research organisation through whom the funding application was made.

DNA Extraction and 16S rRNA gene amplification

The swabs were thawed on ice and transferred into Matrix E tubes (MP Biomedicals) with flamed tweezers. The DNA extraction was performed using FastDNA Spin Kit (MP Biomedicals) according the manufacturer's protocol with following derivations: The bead beating step was done with MagNA Lyser (Roche Diagnostic GmbH) at 6400rpm for twice 30 seconds and the first centrifugation step was performed with 10 minutes. For every DNA extraction run, one extraction control (kit control) was processed with the samples to control the sterility of the used kit system. The concentration of the DNA was determined using Qubit ds-

DNA HS Assay Kit (Invitrogen AG) according the manufacturer's protocol. DNA concentrations of all samples were under detection limit. The extracted DNA was stored at -20°C till further downstream applications.

To amplify 16S rRNA gene V4 region of healthy skin microbial communities, PCR (polymerase chain reaction) was performed by using 1-2µl of the extracted DNA as template. Forward (GTG YCA GCM GCC GCG GTA) and reverse (GGG ACT ACN VGG GTW TCT ATT) primers [66] were added to a final concentration of 200nM. Following cycling conditions were applied: initial denaturation at 94°C for 3 minutes, 35 cycles of denaturation at 94°C for 45 seconds, annealing at 50°C for 60 seconds and elongation at 72°C for 90 seconds, followed by final elongation at 72°C for 10 minutes.

To visualise the PCR products, agarose gel electrophoresis was performed with 1.5% agarose gel for 35 minutes at 70V. We applied Roti Gel Stain (Carl Roth GmbH + Co. KG) as DNA intercalate to dye the DNA, and Fastruler Low Range (Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc.) ladder to assess the size of the PCR products. PCR products were stored at -20°C till sequencing. Library construction and Illumina sequencing (MiSeq) was performed by the Core Facility Molecular Biology at the Center for Medical Research (Graz, Austria). Samples were barcoded during library preparation, but the barcodes are not relevant anymore as the data was used as sample specific forward and reverse fastq-files. Library preparation followed the procedure of previous work, particularly the chapter "Total DNA Isolation, 16S Library Preparation and Sequencing" [67].

Data Analysis

The obtained 16S rRNA sequences were processed using QIIME 2 (Version 2018.11.0). The data were processed and all required files were formatted as described by the QIIME developers (<https://docs.qiime2.org/>): First the fastq data were imported and the sequences were filtered and denoised with DADA 2. After the quality check, the sequences were trimmed to a minimum length of 300bp and a maximum of 350bp. The taxonomy was assigned using 16S rRNA gene reference sequences of the Silva database (version 132).

From the OTUs, alpha and beta diversity analyses were performed using Calypso (<http://cgenome.net/calypso/>) [68]. For Calypso, the data was normalised using Total Sum Normalisation (TSS) and transformed using SquareRoot transformation, no samples removed, no taxa removed and no cut off for rare taxa. Chloroplast and Cyanobacteria were removed. On healthy skin, cyanobacteria have been found to contaminate samples due to their similarity, sequence-wise, to the DNA sequences of chloroplast which can be present after application and long term use of herbal skin care products [69]. We did not ask the participants to complete questionnaires on their skin care regime, so do not know if this would have been applicable. The number of raw reads per sample can be seen in the raw sequence read files (fastq).

For alpha diversity analysis, samples with less than 6600 sequence reads were filtered out to calculate the diversity indices reliably. The removed samples included controls (buffer -, kit - and PCR controls) and one sample of a female study subject. We analysed alpha diversity using both Chao1 and Shannon diversity metrics. For an explanation of the Chao1 index, and how it is different to Shannon, see our first paper [24] or previous work [70,71]. We use Shannon in this paper to evaluate the ‘even-ness’ or spread of organisms distributed in a system. Chao1 is a part of the ‘standardised’ methodology we use for our skin health measuring mechanism. Filtering was performed, because Chao1 and Shannon analyses rarify the number of reads to the lowest number of reads in a sample, and with too few sequences these analyses are not reliable.

Beta diversity between the samples, the overall structural similarity and variation between the microbiomes using the variables under investigation, was also examined. For beta diversity analysis no samples and no taxa were removed in order to visualize the differences between skin microbiome samples and controls. Control samples typically carry very few sequence-reads. Rarefaction analyses were done to assess how well the data represents the diversity of the microbial communities. Here the limit for statistical significance was set to a p-value of $p=0.001$, due to multiple testing. PCoA plots were included, which is a statistical technique that uses clusters of samples which have similar biological communities to assess differences in them in a simple graphical form. Additionally, sequence data from a previous study [30] were compared with the new data set regarding their alpha and beta diversity.

Results

Benchmark for Healthy Western Skin

The alpha diversity of the human participants ($n = 50$; male = 25 & female = 25) in this study (fig. 1.a & 1.b) is compared to all participants from our previous work, which used 32 western human participants from the town of Graz in Austria, all of whom were female, measured at T1 before product use started [30]. This meant they also resembled a normal western person’s skin. The studies were very similar, with average diversity slightly higher in the previous study. All samples (old and new study) were processed using identical procedures from sampling and sample processing to sequencing, including analysing the previous data with QIIME 2. In beta diversity (fig. 1.c & 1.d), the studies show very separate groupings, which suggest ‘batch effect’ - there is no specific factor or reason, which could be controlled, for this difference. Another possible reason for the difference could be processing the data with the QIIME 2 pipeline in this study, compared with the previous version, QIIME, in the previous study. This may imply that the studies should not be compared because their data was obtained from different sequencing runs. However, we only included this comparison as a point of interest; the main aim was to establish the most accurate benchmark value for skin microbiome diversity of healthy ‘western’

skin, which has been achieved, and the value can now update our skin-health measuring mechanism.

Age

In this section, we split the alpha and beta diversity results into age groups: group 1 (18-27 years), group 2 (28-37 years), group 3 (38-47 years), group 4 (48-57 years) and group 5 (58-70 years). There were five males and five females in each group. In alpha diversity, Chao1 index of different age groups shows a loose general trend of decreasing alpha diversity with increasing age, but the observation is not statistically significant (fig. 2.a). The Shannon Index of the age groups shows less of this trend (fig. 2.b). The highest average diversity was observed in Group 2 in both Chao1 and Shannon index, while group 4 displayed the lowest in both. There was an increase in average diversity from group 1 to 2, and from Group 4 to 5. Following the above indication of age-related alterations in alpha diversity, we again further explored the relationship between the microbiome and age, which was also applied in Sections 3.3. and 3.4. In beta diversity (fig. 2.c & fig. 2.d), PCoA plots, which are used to explore and visualize similarities and differences between microbial communities, showed no significant clustering of the age groups. Although there were no significant alpha diversity changes, age-related alterations in community structure and membership, and their effect on the diversification linked to age would need to be investigated in more detail. Redundancy analysis (RDA -plots) showed no significant differences between the age groups (fig. 3). The axes of the RDA plots show a small percentage, indicating that the variance of the data is not substantial.

Sex

In this section we split the alpha and beta diversity results by sex. Of the 50 human participants, 25 were male and 25 were female. There were no statistically significant differences in alpha diversity comparing sex (fig. 4.a & fig. 4.b), however the average diversity was slightly higher in males using Shannon diversity, but slightly lower in Chao1. No clustering of sex (fig. 4.c & 4.d) in beta diversity could be observed, but again the controls were grouped separately. Redundancy analysis (RDA -plots) showed significant differences between female and male study subjects (fig. 5). The axes of the RDA plots show a small percentage, indicating that the variance of the data is not substantial.

Control Testing

Analysing the difference in microbial communities using the PCoA plots revealed the samples (taken from the 50 human participants) were grouped differently to the controls (buffer -, kit - and PCR controls) which indicates that there was no contamination of the samples, and the sampling and manufacturing process was sterile (fig. 6.a & fig. 6.b). Skin microbiome samples, which group near to the control samples in beta diversity plots, carried a low number of reads like the control samples. Rarefaction analysis shows that there was a sufficient number of sequences to represent the diversity of the healthy skin microbial communities (fig. 6.c).

Discussion

The Effect of Age

Age- and sex-related changes vary across body site, between subjects and different diversity evaluating methodologies [72][73], so we take this into account where possible. It is common knowledge that older humans are more susceptible to onset of inflammatory disorders [74], but it is not known why their microbiomes maybe easier to colonise for opportunistic taxa. Our results show humans 28-37 years old have the highest alpha diversity in both Chao1 and Shannon, and 48-57 the lowest, although no statistical significance. Previous work seemed to mainly agree with our results, but differences could be due to differences in methodology and research design. Two studies found higher alpha diversity in older than younger skin across multiple body sites including the volar forearm, both of which used a ‘young’ (23-37; 21-50 years) and ‘old’ (60-76; 51-90 years) group of Japanese women [75] and Chinese adults [76] respectively. Their groupings, however, took in a wider range of ages than ours, which could have impacted the results. In contrast, not only did the two following studies fit in more with our results, but used age ranges a very similar size to ours. The first, a study on Chinese adults, found greater diversity in the skin microbiome across multiple body sites, including the volar forearm, in younger (25-35 years) than older participants (50-60 years) [73]. The second, a more recent study found Chinese females age 25-35 exhibited a higher alpha diversity in Chao1 than females age 50-63 [77]. They analysed the cheek microbiome which is more moist and sebaceous than arms, legs and trunk [78,79], but less sebaceous than forehead and nose [80]. Age and especially sex related changes in diversity and community structure, therefore, may be more prevalent in the cheeks than sebaceous sites, as changes in sebum levels contribute to a larger alteration of the sebaceous nature of moister and dryer sites, meaning a larger impact on the bacterial communities [81].

Our study uses smaller and more regular age groupings compared to previous work, which gives a more accurate insight into how sensitive diversity is to age. It reveals the problem may be more complex than grouping it by broad age ranges categorised as ‘young’ and ‘old’ and that these could give an inaccurate picture of how age affects diversity. A recent study used samples from 495 human subjects split into age groups the same size as ours[72]. They observed the highest diversity on humans age 20-29 but evaluated the diversity differently (relative abundance of ‘important’ *Corynebacterium* OTUs), rendering it very difficult to compare. The lower average diversity in the age range 18-27 in our study compared to 28-37 could be due to some participants still being ‘adolescents’; previous work reported that adolescents displayed significantly lower diversity than adults [73].

We are still unsure why the age-related changes in diversity occur. We know fundamentally that with aging microbial communities evolve by making use of proteins, lipids, minerals and carbohydrates on the skin [82], and the skin’s ability to produce sebum and retain moisture

changes [83], even though short term changes in trans-epidermal water-loss (TEWL) and diversity appear not to be linked [84]. Men are known to produce higher quantities of sebum, a process which stays stable as they grow older [83], which could mean diversity of the skin microbiome progresses differently with increasing age, in men compared to women.

Host physiology, age, sex and body site and ethnicity are all examples of intrinsic factors that affect the skin microbiome, but some of the observed changes could also be due to extrinsic factors, such as habitat, lifestyle, medication use and exposure to western synthetic chemicals. Previous work shows repeated use of modern synthetic cosmetic products can heavily influence aspects of skin chemistry and alter the microbiome [69] [85] and synthetic ingredients commonly found in skin care products can accelerate the skin aging process [86][87]. The microbiome and skin chemistry are not separate, they are closely linked, and changes in one will influence the other. For example, increasing the pH above natural levels accelerates the aging process [88], and skincare products often have a pH of 5.5 or more, which can dry the skin out, strip it of bacteria and allow the onset of premature aging [89][4]. Therefore, age-related changes could be amplified due to certain factors in our western lifestyle, meaning that humans in rural and more isolated communities (tribes-people) may experience a slower decrease in diversity with age, or may not follow the same pattern.

The Effect of Sex

Previous work describes how the microbial community on human skin is heavily influenced by the sex of humans, across all body sites [73,90–92]. This study found no significant differences in alpha diversity between the sexes, but men carried slightly lower average biodiversity using Chao1, and almost identical using Shannon. This finding was echoed in previous work where it was evident on almost all body sites [73], but most distinct on the glabella, which could be caused by cosmetic application [69]. Interestingly, this difference was statistically significant across far more body sites on humans from rural communities than urban ones, where only one site displayed significance, implying that the effect of sex on bacterial diversity grows smaller on western humans. we were not interested in specific bacteria, our RDA findings showed a significant difference in bacterial communities between men and women, which backed up a previous study that also found a significant difference in alpha diversity between men and women one body site, the palm of the hand [92]. As these were western humans this could further point to an environmental factor in the western world forcing this. However, it used phylogenetic diversity, which makes it hard to compare to our results. A further study observed that, on average, the backs of women again possessed higher alpha diversity using Shannon and Chao1 than men, but like our study it was not significant [93]. As different sampling approaches can achieve different results, we compared ours to those taken by swabbing, the methodology used in this study. Finally, recent work found the average total number of bacteria on the feet of women was an order of magnitude higher than on men, but as alpha diversity analysis methods

(Chao1 and Shannon) taking into account more factors than pure amount of bacteria present, this isn't comparable to our study [94].

The fact that men produce more sebum could influence results, especially on high-sebum areas of the skin. On average, sebaceous areas of the skin are less diverse than dry or moist [73,95,96], which could be due to sebum production increasing skin acidity [91] damaged skin promotes resident bacterial flora's dispersal from the skin and leads to pathogenic bacterial and fungal growth [5,6,21]. This could explain why our results did not show significant differences in diversity between the sexes, because we used the 'dry' volar forearm. Differences in facial cosmetics application, far less pronounced on the forearm than the face, could also have diminished the diversity difference. The generally more acidic skin of men [97,98], associated with lower ecosystem diversity [99], along with amount of cosmetic application and hormone production [98,100], wash frequency (women tend to wash more) [92] and perspiration rate could be reasons for differences between the sexes [91,101].

Limitations and Future Work

We note our study took samples from the volar forearm of human participants. Previous work shows body site strongly influences skin microbial diversity and community structure: dry areas such as the volar forearm, the body site found to have highest diversity, characteristically display higher diversity than sebaceous (such as forehead and cheeks) and moist (inguinal crease and popliteal fossa) areas [28,54,105,72,73,75,95,96,102–104]. Due to the body-site-dependent variability of composition and diversity on the human skin microbiome, benchmark values for diversity should be evaluated on all other body parts such as the face and feet, and for different ethnicities and living locations, split into age and sex. Benchmark diversity values for 'unhealthy' or 'diseased' western skin, and 'perfect' or 'caveman' skin (uncontacted tribes people [38]) will be transferred from our 2017 paper in future work, using the multiplication factors found (ratios) between their value and that of healthy western skin. This will be crucial in aiding diagnostic treatments of skin conditions and evaluations of skin health. We want our mechanism to be able to accurately evaluate the skin health of anyone, taking into account age, sex, body site and ethnicity or area of residence [73]. Ethnicity-related differences are most likely due to difference in lifestyle, not driven by inherent physiological variations between ethnicities [76]. The diversity for skin diseases should also be included, as they have a far bigger effect than factors such as age and sex [93].

In follow up work, a larger sample group should be recruited, so that age-related changes in diversity can be investigated independently in men and women. For women, their hormonal status, premenopausal or menopausal, and menstrual cycle status should be included or kept constant. This is because they are known to affect the cutaneous environment and sebum production; the latter's effect not felt on dry sites such as the volar forearm. The inclusion of more detailed bioinformatic analyses focusing on the specific types of microbe present, such as a

LEfSe, which was beyond the scope or remit of this study for the reasons explained in the introduction, should also be investigated. This may help move us closer to being able to use microbiome community structure as a biomarker in skin health and disease. The role of environmental and social or cultural factors should be further investigated, so their effect can be minimised or factored in for studies on this topic. For example, increased urbanization and hyper-cleanliness culture, indoor living, and exposing our skin to soaps, modern cosmetics, steroids and drugs has led to an alteration of the microbiome [3,4,6,96,106–110]. Synthetic additives in modern cosmetics are increasingly being suggested as contributing to an increase in skin ailments in the western world [111–116] stripping the skin of essential oils and bacteria [4,89]. Participants' drug and skin care regimes should be a key part of the recruiting process, to ensure everyone starts from the same base level and that the variables in question are isolated.

The skin (and gut [117]) microbiomes of humans from rural environments with little or no contact to western civilization display far higher levels of microbial diversity compared to humans in urban city environments [38–40]. Humans living in indoor, urban environments host very different microbial communities than agricultural workers in rural communities [43,73,118], who are exposed to a larger variety of microbes from nature. This forms the biodiversity hypothesis [119,120]. Area of residence for participants should be accounted for in the future.

Conclusions

In this study we determined a benchmark value for the microbial diversity, using the Chao1 index, found on healthy western human skin using a sample size of 50 individuals. This allows us, in future work, to transfer all benchmark levels of diversity from our 2017 paper, and to update our skin health measuring mechanism, which will help us determine which environmental factors, such as synthetic chemicals in modern cosmetics, are a major contributor to the skin allergy epidemic in the western world. Previously there was no way of measuring the health of skin, apart from visual observations of obvious ailments, and the use of individual types of clades of microbe as a biomarker is so far unreliable. We also demonstrated that there appear to be changes, albeit non-significant, in skin microbiome diversity related to age, where 'adults' age 28 to 37 harbour more diverse microbial communities than younger and 'old' subjects. There was no significant difference between men and women. A larger sample group should be used in the future to determine whether age-related diversification differs between men and women. We note changes in the microbiome can be due to external factors such as lifestyle, which aren't the intrinsic aging process, or biological sex, which will need to be accounted for in future work. Moreover, to aid dermatological assessments of susceptibility to infections or disease, and associated treatments, diversity benchmarks split into age, sex, ethnicity or area of residence, body site and skin diseases should be added.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Pavane Consultants Ltd. I would like to extend a thank-you to The Medical University of Graz, who recruited the participants, performed laboratory work, collected samples, and analysed data. I would also like to thank my mother, Linda Russell, whose help in data analysis and organisation of the project was priceless; and lastly my father, Nick Wallen, whose knowledge of statistical analysis within ecology was crucial to the success of the study.

References

1. Hublin JJ, Ben-Ncer A, Bailey SE, Freidline SE, Neubauer S, Skinner MM, et al. New fossils from Jebel Irhoud, Morocco and the pan-African origin of *Homo sapiens*. *Nature*. 2017 Jun 7;546(7657):289–92.
2. Sender R, Fuchs S, Milo R. Revised Estimates for the Number of Human and Bacteria Cells in the Body. *PLOS Biol* [Internet]. 2016 Aug 19 [cited 2019 Nov 12];14(8):e1002533. Available from: <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002533>
3. Cogen AL, Nizet V, Gallo RL. Skin microbiota: a source of disease or defence? *Br J Dermatol*. 2009;158:442–55.
4. Blaser MJ, Falkow S. What are the consequences of the disappearing human microbiota? *Nat Rev Microbiol* [Internet]. 2009;7(12):887–94. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2245>
5. Noble WC. Staphylococci on the skin. In: *The Skin Microflora and Microbial Skin Disease* (Noble, W C, ed). London: Cambridge University Press; 2004. p. 135–52.
6. Holland KT, Bojar R a. Cosmetics: what is their influence on the skin microflora? *Am J Clin Dermatol*. 2002;3(7):445–9.
7. Grice EA, Kong HH, Renaud G, Young AC, Bouffard GG, Blakesley RW, et al. A diversity profile of the human skin microbiota. *Genome Res*. 2008;18(7):1043–50.
8. Sanford JA, Gallo RL. Functions of the skin microbiota in health and disease. *Semin Immunol* [Internet]. 2013 Nov 30 [cited 2017 Dec 20];25(5):370–7. Available from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1044532313000791?via%3Dihub>
9. Barnard, E. & Li H. Shaping of cutaneous function by encounters with commensals. *J Physiol*. 2016;
10. Grice EA, Snitkin ES, Yockey LJ, Bermudez DM, Comparative N, Program S, et al. Longitudinal shift in diabetic wound microbiota correlates with prolonged skin defense response. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* [Internet]. 2010;33107(41):14799–804. Available from: www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1013773107
11. Kong HH, Segre JA. Skin microbiome: looking back to move forward. *J Invest Dermatol*. 2012;132(3 Pt 2):933–9.
12. Christensen GJM, Brüggemann H. Bacterial skin commensals and their role as host guardians. *Benef Microbes* [Internet]. 2014 Jun 9 [cited 2018 Jan 18];5(2):201–15. Available from: <http://www.wageningenacademic.com/doi/10.3920/BM2012.0062>
13. Park B, Iwase T, Liu GY. Intranasal Application of *S. epidermidis* Prevents Colonization by Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in Mice. Ratner AJ, editor. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2011 Oct 5 [cited 2018 Jan 18];6(10):e25880. Available from: <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0025880>
14. Rosebury T. *Microorganisms Indigenous To Man*. New York: McGraw Hill; 1962.
15. Mackowiak PA. The Normal Microbial Flora. *N Engl J Med*. 1982;307:83–93.

16. Smith K, McCoy KD, Macpherson AJ. Use of axenic animals in studying the adaptation of mammals to their commensal intestinal microbiota. *Semin Immunol* [Internet]. 2007 Apr [cited 2018 Jul 16];19(2):59–69. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17118672>
17. Gordon HA, Pesti L. The gnotobiotic animal as a tool in the study of host microbial relationships. *Bacteriol Rev* [Internet]. 1971 Dec [cited 2018 Jul 16];35(4):390–429. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/4945725>
18. Pamer EG. Immune responses to commensal and environmental microbes. *Nat Immunol* [Internet]. 2007 Nov 1 [cited 2018 Jul 16];8(11):1173–8. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17952042>
19. Grice EA. The intersection of microbiome and host at the skin interface: Genomic- and metagenomic-based insights. Vol. 25, *Genome Research*. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press; 2015. p. 1514–20.
20. Katsuyama M, Ichikawa H, Ogawa S, Ikezawa Z. A novel method to control the balance of skin microflora: Part 1. Attack on biofilm of *Staphylococcus aureus* without antibiotics. *J Dermatol Sci*. 2005;38(3):197–205.
21. Lambers H, Piessens S, Bloem A, Pronk H, Finkel P. Natural skin surface pH is on average below 5, which is beneficial for its resident flora. *Int J Cosmet Sci*. 2006;28(5):359–70.
22. Ley RE, Lozupone CA, Hamady M, Knight R, Gordon JI. Worlds within worlds: evolution of the vertebrate gut microbiota. *Nat Rev Microbiol* [Internet]. 2008 Oct [cited 2017 Feb 20];6(10):776–88. Available from: <http://www.nature.com/doi/10.1038/nrmicro1978>
23. Pei Z, Bini EJ, Yang L, Zhou M, Francois F, Blaser MJ. Bacterial biota in the human distal esophagus. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* [Internet]. 2004 Mar 23 [cited 2017 Feb 20];101(12):4250–5. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15016918>
24. Wallen-Russell C, Wallen-Russell S. Meta Analysis of Skin Microbiome: New Link between Skin Microbiota Diversity and Skin Health with Proposal to Use This as a Future Mechanism to Determine Whether Cosmetic Products Damage the Skin. *Cosmetics* [Internet]. 2017 May 14 [cited 2017 Dec 19];4(2):14. Available from: <http://www.mdpi.com/2079-9284/4/2/14>
25. Dessinioti C, Katsambas AD. The role of *Propionibacterium acnes* in acne pathogenesis: facts and controversies. *Clin Dermatol*. 2010;28(1):2–7.
26. Gao Z, Tseng C, Strober BE, Pei Z, Blaser MJ. Substantial Alterations of the Cutaneous Bacterial Biota in Psoriatic Lesions. Ahmed N, editor. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2008 Jul 23 [cited 2020 Mar 8];3(7):e2719. Available from: <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0002719>
27. Gao Z, Tseng C, Pei Z, Blaser MJ. Molecular analysis of human forearm superficial skin bacterial biota. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* [Internet]. 2007 Feb 20 [cited 2017 Feb 21];104(8):2927–32. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17293459>
28. Perez Perez GI, Gao Z, Jourdain R, Ramirez J, Gany F, Clavaud C, et al. Body Site Is a More Determinant Factor than Human Population Diversity in the Healthy Skin Microbiome. McDowell A, editor. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2016 Apr 18 [cited 2018 Jan 15];11(4):e0151990. Available from: <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0151990>
29. Kong HH, Oh J, Deming C, Conlan S, Grice EA, Beatson MA, et al. Temporal shifts in the skin microbiome associated with disease flares and treatment in children with atopic

- dermatitis. *Genome Res* [Internet]. 2012 May [cited 2017 Feb 21];22(5):850–9. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22310478>
30. Wallen-Russell C. The Role of Every-Day Cosmetics in Altering the Skin Microbiome: A Study Using Biodiversity. *Cosmetics* [Internet]. 2018 Dec 27 [cited 2020 Jan 8];6(1):2. Available from: <http://www.mdpi.com/2079-9284/6/1/2>
 31. Finlay BB, Arrieta M-C. *Let Them Eat Dirt. Saving your child from an oversanitized world.* London: Windmill Books; 2016.
 32. Lefcheck JS, Byrnes JEK, Isbell F, Gamfeldt L, Griffin JN, Eisenhauer N, et al. Biodiversity enhances ecosystem multifunctionality across trophic levels and habitats. *Nat Commun* [Internet]. 2015 Apr 24 [cited 2017 Feb 20];6:6936. Available from: <http://www.nature.com/doi/10.1038/ncomms7936>
 33. Balvanera P, Pfisterer AB, Buchmann N, He J-S, Nakashizuka T, Raffaelli D, et al. Quantifying the evidence for biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning and services. *Ecol Lett* [Internet]. 2006 Oct [cited 2017 Feb 20];9(10):1146–56. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00963.x>
 34. Gamfeldt L, Hillebrand H, Jonsson PR. Multiple functions increase the importance of biodiversity for overall ecosystem functioning. *Ecology* [Internet]. 2008 May [cited 2017 Feb 20];89(5):1223–31. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18543617>
 35. Thrupp LA. The importance of biodiversity in agroecosystems. *J Crop Improv* [Internet]. 2004 Dec [cited 2017 Feb 20];12(1–2):315–37. Available from: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1300/J411v12n01_03
 36. Hooper DU, Chapin FS, Ewel JJ, Hector A, Inchausti P, Lavorel S, et al. Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: a consensus of current knowledge. *Ecol Monogr* [Internet]. 2005 Feb [cited 2017 Feb 20];75(1):3–35. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/04-0922>
 37. Srinivas G, Möller S, Wang J, Künzel S, Zillikens D, Baines JF, et al. Genome-wide mapping of gene–microbiota interactions in susceptibility to autoimmune skin blistering. *Nat Commun* [Internet]. 2013 Sep 17 [cited 2017 Feb 20];4:2462. Available from: <http://www.nature.com/doi/10.1038/ncomms3462>
 38. Clemente JC, Pehrsson EC, Blaser MJ, Sandhu K, Gao Z, Wang B, et al. The microbiome of uncontacted Amerindians. *Sci Adv.* 2015;1(3).
 39. Blaser MJ, Dominguez-Bello MG, Contreras M, Magris M, Hidalgo G, Estrada I, et al. Distinct cutaneous bacterial assemblages in a sampling of South American Amerindians and US residents. *ISME J* [Internet]. 2013 Jan 16 [cited 2017 Feb 21];7(1):85–95. Available from: <http://www.nature.com/doi/10.1038/ismej.2012.81>
 40. Salgado VR, Queiroz ATL de, Sanabani SS, Oliveira CI de, Carvalho EM, Costa JML, et al. The microbiological signature of human cutaneous leishmaniasis lesions exhibits restricted bacterial diversity compared to healthy skin. *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz* [Internet]. 2016 Apr [cited 2017 Feb 21];111(4):241–51. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27074253>
 41. Hoffmann AR, Patterson AP, Diesel A, Lawhon SD, Ly HJ, Stephenson CE, et al. The skin microbiome in healthy and allergic dogs. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(1).
 42. Gardiner M, Vicaretti M, Sparks J, Bansal S, Bush S, Liu M, et al. A longitudinal study of the diabetic skin and wound microbiome. *PeerJ* [Internet]. 2017 Jul 20 [cited 2018 Jul 18];5:e3543. Available from: <https://peerj.com/articles/3543>
 43. Grice EA, Segre JA. The skin microbiome. *Nat Rev Microbiol* [Internet]. 2011;9(4):244–

53. Available from:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21407241>
<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=PMC3535073>
44. Baviera G, Leoni MC, Capra L, Cipriani F, Longo G, Maiello N, et al. Microbiota in healthy skin and in atopic eczema. *Biomed Res Int* [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2018 Jul 18];2014:436921. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25126558>
45. Manasson J, Reddy SM, Neimann AL, Segal LN, Scher JU. Cutaneous Microbiota Features Distinguish Psoriasis from Psoriatic Arthritis [abstract]. *Arthritis Rheumatol* [Internet]. 2016;68. Available from: <https://acrabstracts.org/abstract/cutaneous-microbiota-features-distinguish-psoriasis-from-psoriatic-arthritis/>
46. Nakatsuji T, Chen TH, Butcher AM, Trzoss LL, Nam S-J, Shirakawa KT, et al. A commensal strain of *Staphylococcus epidermidis* protects against skin neoplasia. *Sci Adv* [Internet]. 2018 Feb [cited 2018 Jul 18];4(2):eaao4502. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29507878>
47. Velegraki A, Cafarchia C, Gaitanis G, Iatta R, Boekhout T. *Malassezia* Infections in Humans and Animals: Pathophysiology, Detection, and Treatment. Heitman J, editor. *PLoS Pathog* [Internet]. 2015 Jan 8 [cited 2018 Nov 12];11(1):e1004523. Available from: <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1004523>
48. Prescott SL, Larcombe D-L, Logan AC, West C, Burks W, Caraballo L, et al. The skin microbiome: impact of modern environments on skin ecology, barrier integrity, and systemic immune programming. *World Allergy Organ J* [Internet]. 2017 Dec 22 [cited 2018 Jul 18];10(1):29. Available from: <http://waojournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40413-017-0160-5>
49. Huang YJ, Marsland BJ, Bunyavanich S, O'Mahony L, Leung DYM, Muraro A, et al. The microbiome in allergic disease: Current understanding and future opportunities-2017 PRACTALL document of the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology and the European Academy of Allergy and Clinical Immunology. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* [Internet]. 2017 Apr 1 [cited 2018 Jul 18];139(4):1099–110. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28257972>
50. Sherwani MA, Tufail S, Muzaffar AF, Yusuf N. The skin microbiome and immune system: Potential target for chemoprevention? *Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed* [Internet]. 2018 Jan [cited 2018 Jul 18];34(1):25–34. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/phpp.12334>
51. Misic AM, Gardner SE, Grice EA. The Wound Microbiome: Modern Approaches to Examining the Role of Microorganisms in Impaired Chronic Wound Healing. *Adv Wound Care* [Internet]. 2014 Jul 9 [cited 2018 Jul 18];3(7):502–10. Available from: <http://www.liebertpub.com/doi/10.1089/wound.2012.0397>
52. Lu LJ, Liu J. Human Microbiota and Ophthalmic Disease. *Yale J Biol Med* [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2018 Jul 18];89(3):325–30. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27698616>
53. Zaidi AK, Spaunhurst K, Sprockett D, Thomason Y, Mann MW, Fu P, et al. Characterization of the facial microbiome in twins discordant for rosacea. *Exp Dermatol* [Internet]. 2018 Mar [cited 2018 Jul 18];27(3):295–8. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29283459>
54. Findley K, Oh J, Yang J, Conlan S, Deming C, Meyer JA, et al. Topographic diversity of fungal and bacterial communities in human skin. *Nature* [Internet]. 2013 Jun 22 [cited

- 2018 Jul 18];498(7454):367–70. Available from:
<http://www.nature.com/articles/nature12171>
55. Gontcharova V, Youn E, Sun Y, Wolcott RD, Dowd SE. A comparison of bacterial composition in diabetic ulcers and contralateral intact skin. *Open Microbiol J* [Internet]. 2010 Aug 31 [cited 2017 Feb 21];4(1):8–19. Available from:
<http://benthamopen.com/ABSTRACT/TOMICROJ-4-8>
 56. Dekio I, Hayashi H, Sakamoto M, Kitahara M, Nishikawa T, Suematsu M, et al. Detection of potentially novel bacterial components of the human skin microbiota using culture-independent molecular profiling. *J Med Microbiol* [Internet]. 2005 Dec 1 [cited 2017 Feb 21];54(12):1231–8. Available from:
<http://jmm.microbiologyresearch.org/content/journal/jmm/10.1099/jmm.0.46075-0>
 57. Bek-Thomsen M, Lomholt HB, Kilian M. Acne is not associated with yet-uncultured bacteria. *J Clin Microbiol* [Internet]. 2008 Oct 1 [cited 2017 Feb 21];46(10):3355–60. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18716234>
 58. Pickford M, Senut B. “Millennium Ancestor” , a 6-million-year-old bipedal hominid from Kenya. *S Afr J Sci*. 2001;97:22.
 59. Kovarovic K. Human evolution: a very short introduction. Vol. 52, *Journal of Human Evolution*. 2007. p. 467.
 60. Halliday TJD, Upchurch P, Goswami A. Resolving the relationships of Paleocene placental mammals. *Biol Rev* [Internet]. 2017 Feb [cited 2017 Feb 21];92(1):521–50. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/brv.12242>
 61. Ley RE, Hamady M, Lozupone C, Turnbaugh PJ, Ramey RR, Bircher JS, et al. Evolution of mammals and their gut microbes. *Science* (80-). 2008;320(5883):1647–51.
 62. NIH HMP Working Group TNHW, Peterson J, Garges S, Giovanni M, McInnes P, Wang L, et al. The NIH Human Microbiome Project. *Genome Res* [Internet]. 2009 Dec [cited 2018 Jan 8];19(12):2317–23. Available from:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19819907>
 63. Grabchak M, Marcon E, Lang G, Zhang Z. The generalized Simpson’s entropy is a measure of biodiversity. Green SJ, editor. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2017 Mar 7 [cited 2020 Mar 8];12(3):e0173305. Available from:
<https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0173305>
 64. Mouillot D, Bellwood DR, Baraloto C, Chave J, Galzin R, Harmelin-Vivien M, et al. Rare Species Support Vulnerable Functions in High-Diversity Ecosystems. *PLoS Biol*. 2013;11(5).
 65. Leitão RP, Zuanon J, Villéger S, Williams SE, Baraloto C, Fortune C, et al. Rare species contribute disproportionately to the functional structure of species assemblages. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci*. 2016 Apr 6;283(1828).
 66. Caporaso JG, Lauber CL, Walters WA, Berg-Lyons D, Lozupone CA, Turnbaugh PJ, et al. Global patterns of 16S rRNA diversity at a depth of millions of sequences per sample. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* [Internet]. 2011 Mar 15 [cited 2018 Feb 5];108 Suppl 1(Supplement 1):4516–22. Available from:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20534432>
 67. Klymiuk I, Bambach I, Patra V, Trajanoski S, Wolf P. 16S Based Microbiome Analysis from Healthy Subjects’ Skin Swabs Stored for Different Storage Periods Reveal Phylum to Genus Level Changes. *Front Microbiol* [Internet]. 2016 Dec 20 [cited 2020 Apr 21];7(DEC):2012. Available from:

- <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmicb.2016.02012/full>
68. Zakrzewski M, Proietti C, Ellis JJ, Hasan S, Brion MJ, Berger B, et al. Calypso: A user-friendly web-server for mining and visualizing microbiome-environment interactions. *Bioinformatics*. 2017;33(5):782–3.
 69. Bouslimani A, Porto C, Rath CM, Wang M, Guo Y, Gonzalez A, et al. Molecular cartography of the human skin surface in 3D. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2015 Apr 28;112(17):E2120–9.
 70. Chao A. Nonparametric Estimation of the Number of Classes in a Population. *Nonparametric Estimation of the Number of Classes in a Population*. *Scand J Stat [Internet]*. 1984 [cited 2018 Dec 14];11(4):265–70. Available from: [http://dns2.asia.edu.tw/~ysho/YSHO-English/1000 Taiwan \(Independent\)/PDF/Sca J Sta11, 265.pdf](http://dns2.asia.edu.tw/~ysho/YSHO-English/1000 Taiwan (Independent)/PDF/Sca J Sta11, 265.pdf)
 71. Colwell RK, Coddington JA. Estimating terrestrial biodiversity through extrapolation. Hawksworth DL, editor. *Philos Trans R Soc London Ser B Biol Sci [Internet]*. 1994 Jul 29 [cited 2018 Dec 14];345(1311):101–18. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7972351>
 72. Dimitriu PA, Iker B, Malik K, Leung H, Mohn WW, Hillebrand GG. New insights into the intrinsic and extrinsic factors that shape the human skin microbiome. *MBio*. 2019 Jul 1;10(4).
 73. Ying S, Zeng D-N, Chi L, Tan Y, Galzote C, Cardona C, et al. The Influence of Age and Gender on Skin-Associated Microbial Communities in Urban and Rural Human Populations. Badger JH, editor. *PLoS One [Internet]*. 2015 Oct 28 [cited 2018 Jan 9];10(10):e0141842. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26510185>
 74. Kim HO, Kim HS, Youn JC, Shin EC, Park S. Serum cytokine profiles in healthy young and elderly population assessed using multiplexed bead-based immunoassays. *J Transl Med*. 2011 Jul 20;9(1).
 75. Shibagaki N, Suda W, Clavaud C, Bastien P, Takayasu L, Iioka E, et al. Aging-related changes in the diversity of women’s skin microbiomes associated with oral bacteria. *Sci Rep*. 2017 Dec 1;7(1).
 76. Leung MHY, Wilkins D, Lee PKH. Insights into the pan-microbiome: Skin microbial communities of Chinese individuals differ from other racial groups. *Sci Rep*. 2015 Jul 16;5.
 77. Kim HJ, Kim JJ, Myeong NR, Kim T, Kim DA, An S, et al. Segregation of age-related skin microbiome characteristics by functionality. *Sci Rep*. 2019 Dec 1;9(1).
 78. Tagami H. Location-related differences in structure and function of the stratum corneum with special emphasis on those of the facial skin. *Int J Cosmet Sci [Internet]*. 2008 Dec [cited 2020 Jan 10];30(6):413–34. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1468-2494.2008.00459.x>
 79. Elias PM. Stratum Corneum Defensive Functions: An Integrated View. *J Invest Dermatol [Internet]*. 2005 Aug [cited 2020 Jan 10];125(2):183–200. Available from: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0022202X15323939>
 80. Lee MR, Nam GW, Jung YC, Park SY, Han JY, Cho JC, et al. Comparison of the skin biophysical parameters of Southeast Asia females: forehead-cheek and ethnic groups. *J Eur Acad Dermatology Venereol [Internet]*. 2013 Dec [cited 2020 Jan 10];27(12):1521–6. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/jdv.12042>
 81. Mukherjee S, Mitra R, Maitra A, Gupta S, Kumaran S, Chakraborty A, et al. Sebum and

- Hydration Levels in Specific Regions of Human Face Significantly Predict the Nature and Diversity of Facial Skin Microbiome. *Sci Rep*. 2016 Oct 27;6.
82. Mathieu A, Delmont TO, Vogel TM, Robe P, Nalin R, Simonet P. Life on Human Surfaces: Skin Metagenomics. Bereswill S, editor. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2013 Jun 12 [cited 2019 Dec 17];8(6):e65288. Available from: <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0065288>
 83. Luebberding S, Krueger N, Kerscher M. Skin physiology in men and women: *in vivo* evaluation of 300 people including TEWL, SC hydration, sebum content and skin surface pH. *Int J Cosmet Sci* [Internet]. 2013 Oct [cited 2019 Dec 17];35(5):477–83. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ics.12068>
 84. Wallen-Russell C. Is There a Relationship between Transepidermal Water Loss and Microbial Biodiversity on the Skin? *Cosmetics* [Internet]. 2019 Mar 9 [cited 2019 Dec 17];6(1):18. Available from: <https://www.mdpi.com/2079-9284/6/1/18>
 85. Callewaert C, Hutapea P, Van de Wiele T, Boon N. Deodorants and antiperspirants affect the axillary bacterial community. *Arch Dermatol Res*. 2014 Sep 19;306(8):701–10.
 86. Garza DR, Van Verk MC, Huynen MA, Dutilh BE. Towards predicting the environmental metabolome from metagenomics with a mechanistic model. *Nat Microbiol*. 2018 Apr 1;3(4):456–60.
 87. Averbek M, Gebhardt CA, Voigt S, Beilharz S, Anderegg U, Termeer CC, et al. Differential regulation of hyaluronan metabolism in the epidermal and dermal compartments of human skin by UVB irradiation. *J Invest Dermatol*. 2007 Mar;127(3):687–97.
 88. Farage MA, Miller KW, Elsner P, Maibach HI. Functional and physiological characteristics of the aging skin. *Aging Clin Exp Res* [Internet]. 2008 Jun 25 [cited 2018 Jul 30];20(3):195–200. Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF03324769>
 89. Jung YC, Kim EJ, Cho JC, Suh KD, Nam GW. Effect of skin pH for wrinkle formation on Asian: Korean, Vietnamese and Singaporean. *J Eur Acad Dermatology Venereol* [Internet]. 2013 Mar [cited 2018 Jul 30];27(3):e328–32. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22830637>
 90. SanMiguel A, Grice EA. Interactions between host factors and the skin microbiome. *Cell Mol Life Sci* [Internet]. 2015 Apr 30 [cited 2018 Jan 9];72(8):1499–515. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25548803>
 91. Giacomoni PU, Mammone T, Teri M. Gender-linked differences in human skin. Vol. 55, *Journal of Dermatological Science*. 2009. p. 144–9.
 92. Fierer N, Hamady M, Lauber CL, Knight R. The influence of sex, handedness, and washing on the diversity of hand surface bacteria. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* [Internet]. 2008 Nov 18 [cited 2018 Jan 9];105(46):17994–9. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19004758>
 93. Stehlikova Z, Kostovcik M, Kostovcikova K, Kverka M, Juzlova K, Rob F, et al. Dysbiosis of Skin Microbiota in Psoriatic Patients: Co-occurrence of Fungal and Bacterial Communities. *Front Microbiol* [Internet]. 2019 Mar 21 [cited 2020 Jan 15];10. Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmicb.2019.00438/full>
 94. Steglińska A, Jachowicz A, Szulc J, Adamiak J, Otlewska A, Pielech-Przybylska K, et al. Factors Influencing Microbiological Biodiversity of Human Foot Skin. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2019 Sep 19;16(18).
 95. Grice EA, Kong HH, Conlan S, Deming CB, Davis J, Young AC, et al. Topographical and

- temporal diversity of the human skin microbiome. *Science* [Internet]. 2009;324(5931):1190–2. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19478181><http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=PMC2805064>
96. Costello EK, Lauber CL, Hamady M, Fierer N, Gordon JI, Knight R. Bacterial Community Variation in Human Body Habitats Across Space and Time. *Science* (80-). 2009;326(5960).
 97. Kim MK, Choi SY, Byun HJ, Huh CH, Park KC, Patel RA, et al. Evaluation of gender difference in skin type and pH [4]. Vol. 41, *Journal of Dermatological Science*. 2006. p. 153–6.
 98. Dao H, Kazin RA. Gender differences in skin: A review of the literature. *Gend Med*. 2007 Dec;4(4):308–28.
 99. Fierer N, Jackson RB. The diversity and biogeography of soil bacterial communities. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2006 Jan 17;103(3):626–31.
 100. Roth RR, James WD. *Microbial Ecology of the Skin*. *Annu Rev Microbiol* [Internet]. 1988 Oct [cited 2020 Jan 9];42(1):441–64. Available from: <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.mi.42.100188.002301>
 101. Marples RR. Sex, constancy, and skin bacteria. *Arch Dermatol Res*. 1982 Sep;272(3–4):317–20.
 102. Oh J, Byrd AL, Park M, Kong HH, Segre JA, Segre JA. Temporal Stability of the Human Skin Microbiome. *Cell* [Internet]. 2016 May 5 [cited 2018 Aug 6];165(4):854–66. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27153496>
 103. Huttenhower C, Gevers D, Knight R, Abubucker S, Badger JH, Chinwalla AT, et al. Structure, function and diversity of the healthy human microbiome. *Nature*. 2012 Jun 14;486(7402):207–14.
 104. Caporaso JG, Lauber CL, Costello EK, Berg-Lyons D, Gonzalez A, Stombaugh J, et al. Moving pictures of the human microbiome. *Genome Biol* [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2019 Dec 17];12(5):R50. Available from: <http://genomebiology.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/gb-2011-12-5-r50>
 105. Oh J, Byrd AL, Deming C, Conlan S, Kong HH, Segre JA, et al. Biogeography and individuality shape function in the human skin metagenome. *Nature*. 2014 Oct 2;514(7520):59–64.
 106. Belkaid Y, Segre JA. Dialogue between skin microbiota and immunity. *Science* (80-) [Internet]. 2014 Nov 21 [cited 2018 Jan 8];346(6212):954–9. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25414304>
 107. Stingley RL, Zou W, Heinze TM, Chen H, Cerniglia CE. Metabolism of azo dyes by human skin microbiota. *J Med Microbiol* [Internet]. 2010 Jan 1 [cited 2018 Jan 8];59(1):108–14. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19729456>
 108. Turnbaugh PJ, Ley RE, Hamady M, Fraser-Liggett CM, Knight R, Gordon JI. The Human Microbiome Project. *Nature* [Internet]. 2007 Oct 18 [cited 2018 Jan 8];449(7164):804–10. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17943116>
 109. Staudinger T, Pipal A, Redl B. Molecular analysis of the prevalent microbiota of human male and female forehead skin compared to forearm skin and the influence of make-up. *J Appl Microbiol* [Internet]. 2011 Jun [cited 2018 Jan 8];110(6):1381–9. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21362117>
 110. Rocha LA, Ferreira de Almeida e Borges L, Gontijo Filho PP. Changes in hands

- microbiota associated with skin damage because of hand hygiene procedures on the health care workers. *Am J Infect Control* [Internet]. 2009 Mar [cited 2018 Jan 8];37(2):155–9. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19249642>
111. Goossens A. Contact-allergic reactions to cosmetics. *J Allergy* [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2017 Feb 21];2011:Article ID 467071. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21461388>
 112. Salverda JGW, Bragt PJC, de Wit-Bos L, Rustemeyer T, Coenraads PJ, Tupker RA, et al. Results of a cosmetovigilance survey in The Netherlands. *Contact Dermatitis* [Internet]. 2013 Mar [cited 2017 Feb 21];68(3):139–48. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23421458>
 113. Heisterberg M V., Menné T, Johansen JD. Contact allergy to the 26 specific fragrance ingredients to be declared on cosmetic products in accordance with the EU cosmetics directive. *Contact Dermatitis* [Internet]. 2011 Nov [cited 2017 Feb 21];65(5):266–75. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21943251>
 114. Warshaw EM, Buchholz HJ, Belsito D V., Maibach HI, Fowler JF, Rietschel RL, et al. Allergic patch test reactions associated with cosmetics: Retrospective analysis of cross-sectional data from the North American Contact Dermatitis Group, 2001-2004. *J Am Acad Dermatol* [Internet]. 2009 Jan [cited 2017 Feb 21];60(1):23–38. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18992965>
 115. Berne B, Tammela M, Färm G, Inerot A, Lindberg M. Can the reporting of adverse skin reactions to cosmetics be improved? A prospective clinical study using a structured protocol. *Contact Dermatitis* [Internet]. 2008 Apr [cited 2017 Feb 21];58(4):223–7. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18353030>
 116. Berne B, Boström A, Grahnén AF, Tammela M. Adverse effects of cosmetics and toiletries reported to the Swedish Medical Products Agency 1989-1994. *Contact Dermatitis* [Internet]. 1996 May [cited 2017 Feb 21];34(5):359–62. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8807231>
 117. De Filippo C, Cavalieri D, Di Paola M, Ramazzotti M, Poullet JB, Massart S, et al. Impact of diet in shaping gut microbiota revealed by a comparative study in children from Europe and rural Africa. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* [Internet]. 2010 Aug 17 [cited 2017 Feb 20];107(33):14691–6. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20679230>
 118. Rosenthal M, Goldberg D, Aiello A, Larson E, Foxman B. Skin microbiota: Microbial community structure and its potential association with health and disease. Vol. 11, *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*. 2011. p. 839–48.
 119. Haahtela T, Holgate S, Pawankar R, Akdis CA, Benjaponpitak S, Caraballo L, et al. The biodiversity hypothesis and allergic disease: World allergy organization position statement. *World Allergy Organ J*. 2013;6(1).
 120. Von Hertzen L, Hanski I, Haahtela T. Natural immunity. Biodiversity loss and inflammatory diseases are two global megatrends that might be related. *EMBO Rep*. 2011 Nov;12(11):1089–93.