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Abstract SARS-CoV-2 has caused millions of infections and deaths worldwide and case numbers continue to rise. Besides the effect of the virus on key organs - leading to respiratory illness, anosmia, diarrhea, and fever and other complications - delayed inflammatory reactions to hyaluronic acid dermal fillers, mainly in the face, have also been reported to occur after confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infections and in vaccinated individuals. While delayed inflammatory reactions tend to be self-limiting, they should be diagnosed and treated with corticosteroids, hyaluronidase, and/or antibiotics when necessary. The inflammation is generally not severe, yet these complications are classified as serious adverse events by the US Food and Drug Administration. They appear to be delayed type IV hypersensitivity reactions triggered by the immune system in the presence of SARS-CoV-2 or other viruses, such as those causing influenza, although the underlying mechanisms have not been fully elucidated. Because the longevity of dermal fillers is increasing, while the pandemic continues to evolve and new vaccines are under development, the long-term effects on hyaluronic acid fillers and other bioimplant materials should be studied. Physicians must also be encouraged to report these reactions, however mild, to ensure accurate records.

© 2022 AEDV. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

PALABRAS CLAVE
COVID-19;
SARS-CoV-2;
Acido hialuronico;
Reacción inmunológica tardía;
Inflamación;
ACE2

COVID y rellenos faciales ¿realmente debemos preocuparnos?

Resumen La pandemia por COVID ha causado hoy en día millones de afectados, continuando su aumento a nivel mundial. Junto con la afectación los órganos claves (pneumónicos y respiratorios, anosmia, diarrea, fiebre, etc.), han descrito reacciones inmunológicas tardías en los rellenos dermicos por ácido hialuronico (AH), fundamentalmente a nivel facial. Estas alteraciones aparecen tanto en pacientes positivos para el virus, independientemente de la sintomatología sistémica, como en pacientes que han recibido vacunación frente al SARS-CoV-2. Aunque las
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En resumen, las reacciones suelen ser autolimitadas y autoresolutorias, es importante saber diagnosticarlas y en ocasiones establecer tratamiento con corticoides, hialuronidasa y/o antibióticos. Aunque no son graves, la Administración de Alimentos y Medicamentos (FDA) de los Estados Unidos las ha clasificado como evento adverso serio. Los mecanismos que originan estas reacciones no están completamente dilucidados. Parece que son reacciones de hipersensibilidad retardada tipo IV, favorecidas por estímulos inmunológicos que se activan en presencia de la COVID o de otros virus como la gripe. Sin embargo, dado que los rellenos presentan cada vez mayor durabilidad y a que la pandemia continúa su curso, existiendo nuevas vacunas en desarrollo, es esencial la realización de estudios que describan la evolución a largo plazo tanto de los rellenos de AH, como de otros bioimplantes. Así mismo, es esencial alentar a los médicos de que reporten este tipo de reacciones, aunque no revistan gravedad con el objetivo de poder realizar un registro fidedigno de ellas.

© 2022 AEDV. Publicado por Elsevier España, S.L.U. Este es un artículo Open Access bajo la licencia CC BY-NC-ND (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

**Introduction**

Hyaluronic acid (HA) is a glycosaminoglycan that forms part of the extracellular matrix. It is secreted by several types of cells (e.g., fibroblasts, synoviocytes, endothelial cells, smooth muscle cells, adventitial cells, and oocytes) and is a component of cell and tissue matrix. It stabilizes cellular components, thus regulating osmotic balance, cell proliferation, adhesion, and migration. The molecular structure of HA is identical in all organisms and is considered biologically inert, thus minimizing the risk of immunogenicity owing to the absence of protein epitopes.

Its biocompatibility and stability at the injection site, together with its cost-effectiveness, make HA an almost ideal dermal filler. Furthermore, the expansion of tissue after injection enables HA to activate fibroblasts, thus stimulating the production of collagen. The number of nonsurgical cosmetic treatments has continued to rise in Spain despite the pandemic, and more than 35.5% of cases involve HA.

The discontinuation of bovine HA and improvements in techniques for obtaining the product through biosynthesis of bacteria from streptococcal strains (Streptococcus equi or Streptococcus zoosporadicus) have considerably reduced the frequency of adverse reactions. However, some risk remains owing to the additives used for stabilization and reticulation and the possibility of contamination by proteins or bacterial RNA during the production process. The frequency of adverse reactions ranges from 0.02% to 0.4%, with percentages of up to 4.25% associated mainly with low-molecular-weight HA.

Since the first case of pneumonia caused by the new coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 reported in December 2019 in Wuhan, China, the pandemic has led to more than 207 780 000 infections throughout the world.

There have been reports of delayed inflammatory reactions to HA fillers in patients who have been in contact with SARS-CoV-2 or who developed COVID-19 and of abnormalities affecting dermal fillers after vaccination. Delayed inflammatory reactions to dermal fillers had been reported before the pandemic and were mainly associated with the common cold or occurred after influenza vaccination.

Importantly, improvements in the synthesis and production of HA increase the longevity of dermal fillers, with some remaining in place in specific areas of the face for up to 5 years. Therefore, we might expect more frequent reports of COVID-19-induced abnormalities.

**Material and methods**

In this paper, we review the pathophysiology and symptoms of delayed inflammatory reactions to dermal fillers associated with COVID-19. We also analyze the most frequent abnormalities associated with dermal fillers reported after vaccination campaigns and discuss their diagnosis and treatment.

We performed a bibliographic review of the available literature. A search of PubMed using the terms "Fillers AND COVID", "Dermal Fillers AND COVID", and "Hyaluronic Acid AND COVID" yielded 77 articles, of which 42 were eventually analyzed. The search was closed on August 28, 2021.

**Results**

We reviewed all case reports and small case series describing abnormalities affecting dermal fillers after SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Munavalli et al. were the first authors to describe these abnormalities in several patients. They reported their diagnostic method, treatment, and outcomes and discussed the use of lansoprazol as an innovative approach to the reactions.

Other authors subsequently reported similar cases, and the United States Food and Drug Administration acknowledged the emergence of immunological reactions associated with COVID-19 and vaccination and even problems affecting breast implants years after placement.

**Discussion**

Delayed inflammatory reactions to HA dermal fillers are classified by time to onset, as follows: early reactions, which
occur between 2 weeks and 1 year after injection, and late
reactions, which occur more than 1 year after injection.
Some authors differentiate between early reactions (first
week), intermediate reactions (1 week to 1 month), and late
reactions (after more than 1 month). In clinical practice, it
is difficult to identify the cause of intermediate and delayed
reactions, although their treatment is similar regardless of
etiology. 

While the factors leading to the reactions remain unclear,
they could be favored by immunologic triggers (e.g., anti-
bodies against HA, residual bacterial RNA or proteins that
contaminate HA once produced), bacteria transmitted to
the inner surface of the skin during injection and generat-
ing biofilms, low-quality products, bacterial infections (e.g.,
sinusitis, infections resulting from dental procedures), and
viral infections (mainly those manifesting with flu-like symp-
toms or after influenza vaccination). 

Recent improvements in the reticulation and stabilize-
tion of HA have led to fillers that are much more resistant
to enzymatic degradation, thus increasing their longevity.
Given that current fillers last between 2 and 5 years in cer-
tain areas of the face, we can expect an increase in the
frequency of reactions in the coming years. 

As for pathophysiology, SARS-CoV-2 invades cells through
binding of its long membrane protein (S) to the 1 domain
of angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) 2. This 1273-amino
acid protein projects through the viral envelope, leading
to the crown-like appearance. Thus, the virus is anchored
to the cell, leading to cellular fusion, release of RNA to
the cytoplasm, and infection of the new cell. Some
authors have shown that SARS-CoV-2 can only enter cells
that express ACE2. Importantly, ACE is the target not only
of the new coronavirus, but also of several coronaviruses
and the influenza virus. 

ACE2 is widely distributed in all tissues, although it
is particularly abundant in the heart, vessels (vascular
endothelium and smooth muscle), intestine, lung (trache-
al and bronchial endothelium, type 2 pneumocytes,
macrophages), kidneys, testicles, and brain. ACE2 levels
are also high in the skin, mainly in fibroblasts and ker-
tinocytes, and in adipose tissue, which is the most common
placement site. 

ACE2 plays a key role in the regulation of arterial
blood pressure and antiatherosclerotic mechanisms. On
binding to ACE2, SARS-CoV-2 modifies its physiological
activity by altering the balance between ACE/ACE2 and
angiotensin II/angiotensin, leading to an increase in
angiotensin II and its binding to the AT1 receptor and favor-
ing deleterious effects, such as vasoconstriction, fibrosis,
inflammation, thrombosis, lung damage with edema, and
increased permeability (Fig. 1). 

In addition, COVID-19 increases expression of inflam-
matory mediators (mainly interleukin [IL] 6, IL-2, IL-8,
monocyte chemoattractant protein 1, interferon γ inducible
protein 10) and induces recruitment of inflammatory cells,
which are known as a deficient interferon response and produc-
tion of antibodies. 

The hypersensitivity reactions that give way to delayed
inflammatory reactions are thought to be type IV, trig-
gered by T lymphocytes and mediated by CD4. These may
be induced by viral infections, which in turn activate
macrophages. 

Seasonal prevalence has been reported,
with reactions occurring mainly in fall and winter or after
influenza infection. 

The degree of activation of the immune system also
depends on the molecular weight of HA. High-molecular-
weight HA mainly exerts an anti-inflammatory effect,
whereas low-molecular-weight HA (<500 kDa) is proinflam-
atory and may act as an endogenous signal, activating the
immune system itself. Furthermore, the lower concen-
tration and viscosity increase immunogenicity, because the
increased rate of metabolism and degradation increases
the area of low-molecular-weight HA exposed and of frag-
ments of HA with a proinflammatory effect. Thus, dermal fillers
lead to low-molecular-weight HA owing to degradation of
the product and to binding agents. 

HA acts as the main ligand of CD44, a glycoprotein
expressed in mammalian cells that intervenes in cell signaling
processes and is increased in viral infections. Its binding
to HA leads to activation and recruitment of lymphocytes. 

Some authors have also suggested that systemic inflam-
matory responses, such as those caused by flu-like illness,
can favor degradation of dermal fillers owing to the pro-
duction of free radicals, thus giving way to fragments of
low-molecular-weight HA that act as CD44 ligands. Further-
more, the increase in low-molecular-weight HA leads to
recruitment of lymphocytes to the area of the filler where
the HA concentration is strongest. 

Therefore, while the sensitization process is not com-
pletely clear, the presence of filler itself seems to be a risk
factor for hypersensitivity reactions in the presence of sys-
temic infection, and this in turn seems to be the cause of edema affecting HA fillers after infection by SARS-CoV-2. 

Modification of HA molecules to increase the longevity of the fillers entails a greater presence of impurities, which are
associated with an increase in hypersensitivity reactions. 

Similar findings have been reported for HA when used in
other medical techniques. 

The formulation of granulomas and fibrosis may be due to
the absence of total phagocytosis of the HA fragments,
combined with the formation of biofilm and activation of
T cells that are common after implantation of biomateri-
als. Increased expression of ACE2 in the skin plays a key
role in maintaining an appropriate immune response. Alter-
ations in free ACE produced by the virus increase the amount
of angiotensin II and the probability of a proinflammatory
response that can affect the dermis. 

As mentioned above, ACE2 levels are high in fibro-
blasts and keratinocytes. The enzyme is especially abundant
in the endothelium and mid and deep dermis and in the
subcutaneous microvasculature. Given that HA stimulates
angiogenesis, ACE2 levels may increase at the sites of short-
or long-term implants, thus increasing the likelihood of
delayed reactions after acute infection by SARS-CoV-2 or
vaccination. 

COVID also leads to complement activation, especially
in subcutaneous fatty tissue, leading to microvasculature
abnormalities, endothelial cell denudation, basement mem-
brane zone reduplication, and small thrombi. 

Individual characteristics can also play a role in the
development of a delayed inflammatory reaction. The com-
bination of the haplotypes HLA-B*08 and DR1*03 increased
4-fold the likelihood of late-onset adverse events after
injection of dermal filler.
Delayed inflammatory reactions usually manifest as edema, abnormal skin coloration (mainly erythema), tissue induration, and potentially painful nodules.\(^7,15,22\) According to a study by the International Society for Dermatology and Aesthetic Surgery, 15% of patients experienced swelling after their filler injections.\(^1,13\) Munavalli et al.\(^11\) were the first to report facial filler abnormalities in patients who had contact with COVID or were vaccinated in January 2021. Patients experienced burning sensation or swelling at the site where the filler was injected, in addition to facial edema, erythema, and increased sensitivity. Some patients reported a transient improvement lasting a few days, albeit with subsequent increased reddening and indurated nodules that occasionally progressed to intermittent erythema. While the patients progressed favorably, they did require corticosteroids, antibiotics, hyaluronidase, and, in 1 case, lisinopril.

The start of the vaccination campaign was followed by reports of inflammatory reactions associated with Pfizer BioNTech (BNT162b2) and Moderna (mRNA-1273).\(^14,23\) Data on cases recorded in clinical trials show 414 reactions in persons vaccinated from December 2020 to February 2021.\(^14\) Symptoms appeared 12–24 h after vaccination. The reactions comprised mainly vesicular, urticarial, macular, and papular eruptions, as well as swelling at the site of the facial filler (9 cases), pernio/chilblains (8 cases), varicella zoster (10 cases), herpes simplex (4 cases), and nonspecific rashes in the infants of vaccinated breastfeeding mothers (4 cases). The reactions were generally mild.\(^14\)

The authors attributed the reactions to T lymphocyte-mediated delayed hypersensitivity, associating them with excipients such as neomycin, thiomesal, and polyethylene glycol. Therefore, they were not considered contraindications to further doses of the vaccine.\(^14\) Another proposed cause was stimulation of hypersensitivity by an immunologic trigger, as previously reported after viral disease and influenza vaccine.\(^14,23\) The authors count as limitations to their study incomplete follow-up and information bias owing to the tendency to report mainly severe reactions.\(^14\)

The US Food and Drug Administration recognized facial swelling as an adverse effect in patients who had previously received dermal fillers. Edema was recognized as a severe effect, even though the 3 cases reported during phase 3 of the Moderna trial were successfully treated with corticosteroids and antihistamines.\(^12,23\) The US Food and Drug Administration stated that filler abnormalities could be...
caused by the inflammatory response arising from the interaction between the immune response caused by vaccination and the dermal filler. The registry did not identify subsequent complications or sequelae, and patients responded appropriately to topical corticosteroids, antihistamines, and analogs. Antibiotics were required on occasions where the patient was thought to be developing cellulitis.

Although treatment was always administered on an individual basis, most patients initially received methylprednisolone 1 mg/kg for 8–14 days, antibiotics (mainly doxycyclin), although trimethoprim–sulfamethoxazole was also administered) for 1–3 weeks, and hyaluronidase, with occasional repeated doses in the case of increased swelling after the first injection. Moreover, poorer responses required the addition of 5-fluorouracil, long-term corticosteroids, and antihistamines, although these are of limited value.

Oral corticosteroids are the initial therapy for delayed inflammatory reactions after vaccination. Importantly, a skin test with 0.1 mL of hyaluronidase should be carried out before treatment.

Recurrent of inflammation is common, and patients should be warned about this possibility. Some patients can experience a delayed inflammatory reaction to fillers owing to COVID-19, even if they do not present symptoms of the disease.

Low-dose oral lisinopril (5 mg) has been reported to be successful, with resolution of edema at 24–48 h. Lisinopril can reduce delayed inflammatory reactions caused by vaccination and has been proposed as pemecidetan before vaccination in patients with a history of delayed inflammatory reaction to HA filler or who have experienced reactions after the first vaccination. Its benefit arises from its ability to block ACE1 production. This reduces production of angiotensin II and the substrate for ACE2, thus offsetting the action of COVID-19. Furthermore, given its rapid onset of action, lisinopril diminishes secretion of aldosterone by the adrenal cortex, thus increasing excretion of sodium and, therefore, water outflow. This leads to rapid resolution of the facial edema associated with delayed inflammatory reaction. However, no studies have yet demonstrated its benefits.

Naouri et al. reported cases of granuloma formation in patients who received interferon (cytokines). In this setting, granuloma may be caused by the cytokine storm resulting from SARS-CoV-2 infection. Before the pandemic, immunologic complications of fillers were reported in 0.8–0.9% of cases.

Delayed inflammatory reactions associated with SARS-CoV-2 generally self-resolve in days or weeks. In the case of painless nodules measuring less than 0.5 cm, patients are recommended to be vigilat. In the case of larger nodules, with edema and erythema that are painful and do not improve, treatment should be initiated. The nodules are usually inflammatory in nature, although the possibility that they are due to an infectious process caused by biofilms and atypical microorganisms must be ruled out. Culture for aerobic and anaerobic bacteria, mycobacteria, and fungi is necessary if the nodule fluctuates in size.

Ghasemi et al. report several similar cases. One patient developed symptoms following the injection of filler 2 days after receiving the Moderna vaccine. In the case of patients with a COVID-positive polymerase chain reaction assay result, symptoms developed after 2 weeks. The nodules resolved 6 weeks later.

In June 2021, Michon also reported 2 cases of delayed inflammatory reaction after administration of the Pfizer vaccine. In the first case, the patient experienced reddening and swelling affecting the tear trough, where an HA filler had been injected 6 weeks earlier with no complications. The patient also developed flu-like symptoms, such as tiredness, headache, joint pain, and anorexia, which resolved in the following days. The adverse reaction itself had resolved spontaneously by day 5. In the second case, the patient received the first dose of the Pfizer vaccine 9 months after receiving panfacial injections of filler. Some days after vaccination, she developed intermittent facial swelling and reddening that mainly affected the cheeks and area under the eye. This lasted approximately 1 day. Three weeks later, she had developed undereye swelling that was worse than before, although no erythema or nodules were present. She was treated with hyaluronidase, and her condition resolved completely.

While not the object of the present review, it is worth mentioning changes in breast implants following injection of the Pfizer, AstraZeneca, and Janssen vaccines. Most cases progressed perfectly with analgesic and anti-inflammatory treatment, although in 1 case, the patient developed an infection that required surgical lavage and withdrawal of the prosthesis. Restifo reported the case of capsular contracture of a breast implant 20 days after administration of the second dose of the Pfizer vaccine.

The duration of delayed inflammatory reactions following COVID-19 seems to be associated with the amount of the initial filler, the technique (bolus/nonbolus), and the duration of the placement. Moreover, several inflammatory cytokines resulting from COVID-19 are potent inducers of the metabolism of HA. Altered synthesis and deposition of HA is well established in respiratory distress syndrome. Depolymerization of HA in airway epithelial cells triggers the inflammatory cascade that leads to production of cytokines. In addition, proinflammatory cytokines stimulate exudation of HA in the airway itself. Consequently, SARS-CoV-2 clearly interacts with HA, thereby modifying it.

Guidelines on dermal fillers were published in March 2020, although the pandemic has, to a certain extent, necessitated modifications. Strict asepsis and prophylaxis to cover the risk of infection are key to ensuring safety during treatment. While the pandemic continues, the ideal approach would undoubtedly be serology testing to determine the patient’s immune status.

Goodman et al. proposed a model for management in the cosmetic medicine clinic during the pandemic. The model comprises a series of points: (a) administration of a health questionnaire for screening purposes and to determine risk contacts; (b) use of telemedicine when possible; (c) identification of patients at high risk of developing severe COVID-19 (smokers, diabetics, obese persons, elderly persons, persons with comorbid conditions) and deferring cosmetic treatment until the risk has decreased; (d) avoiding combination treatment, since this takes longer and increases risk, with the recommendation to stage treatments; (e) maintaining social distancing and regular disinfection in the waiting room; (f) noncontact temperature testing; (g) stressing the importance of hand washing...
on the days following treatment, since patients frequently touch the areas of the face where the filler was injected; and (h) appropriate use of personal protective equipment; i) in the case of a high risk of transmission, it is necessary to consider deferring treatment until the risk decreases.

In addition to these principles, the authors stress that it is always necessary to have hyaluronidase ready in case the patient presents signs of vascular occlusion. The skin should be disinfected, preferably with alcohol or povidone iodine. As little pressure as possible should be applied during the injection, which should be performed slowly, with subsequent massage of the area to ensure that the filler is evenly distributed.31

An interval of at least 3 weeks after COVID-19 vaccination should be left before injecting filler in order to avoid the peak immune response, which occurs at 21 days.8

In conclusion, the true etiology of delayed immunologic reactions appearing in association with HA fillers and SARS-CoV-2 infection or with antibodies generated after vaccination remains unclear. Since delayed immunologic reactions secondary to vaccination are mild and self-limiting, the possibility of complications arising from facial filler should not discourage vaccination. An interval of at least 3 weeks should be left between vaccination against COVID-19 and injection of a filler in order to avoid the peak immune response at 21 days. Fillers should be avoided in patients with the combination of HLA B*08 and DRB1*03. Interviews with several cosmetic physicians revealed a certain degree of concern over the increased frequency of delayed inflammatory reactions, which were not observed in the pre-COVID era. The respondents’ subjective perception is that these are due to vaccination or to the disease itself. Given that these reactions do not require treatment or can be managed with low-dose corticosteroids, most cases go unreported, with the result that there are no reliable records. We highlight the importance of appropriate patient selection and follow-up and of ensuring that the cosmetic procedures are carried out by appropriately trained professionals who can diagnose and treat potential complications. Patients should be aware of the risks of undergoing these treatments with unqualified professionals.
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