EURASIAN JOURNAL OF CHEMICAL, MEDICINAL AND PETROLEUM RESEARCH

Volume 4, Issue 3

Eurasian Journal of Chemical, Medicinal and Petroleum Research

Journal homepage: https://www.ejcmpr.com/

DOI: https://zenodo.org/records/17166530

The Value of a New Filler Material in Corrective and Cosmetic Surgery: A Clinical Perspective on Derma Live and Derma Deep

Amir Hashemloo[1], Maryam Milanifard[2,3*]

[1]General practitioner (MD) , Restorative Cosmetic Doctor, Private Practice, Tehran, Iran
[2]Trauma and Injury Research Center, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran
[3]PhD of Anatomy, Student Research Committee, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

Article info
Received: 24.07.2025
Accepted: 05.09.2025
Available Online: 20.09.2025
Checked for Plagiarism: Yes

Keywords:
New Filler Material, Corrective and Cosmetic Surgery, Derma Live and Derma Deep, hypothetical data.

ABSTRACT

The field of facial aesthetic medicine has evolved significantly, with injectable fillers playing a pivotal role in both reconstructive and cosmetic procedures. Recently, hybrid fillers such as Derma Live and Derma Deep have gained attention for their dual properties of volume restoration and biostimulation. This article explores the clinical value of these new-generation fillers, analyzing their composition, indications, safety profile, and outcomes in facial correction. Drawing from existing studies and real-world application, we assess their effectiveness in deep dermal and subdermal applications, particularly in nasolabial folds, malar augmentation, and post-traumatic defects. Hypothetical data from a prospective cohort of 100 patients treated with Derma Live or Derma Deep indicate high patient satisfaction, sustained aesthetic results up to 18 months, and minimal complications. This positions them as a promising alternative to conventional fillers in selected patients. However, precise injection technique and patient selection remain essential due to rare, but significant, risks of delayed nodular reaction. The study emphasizes the importance of clinician experience, dermal assessment, and post-care monitoring in optimizing outcomes with hybrid fillers like Derma Live and Derma Deep.

Introduction

The contemporary landscape of aesthetic and corrective dermatology has witnessed an unprecedented transformation, particularly with the evolution of dermal fillers that offer minimally invasive solutions to facial volume loss, contour irregularities, and age-related changes. Among the burgeoning innovations [1], Derma Live and Derma Deep have emerged as hybrid dermal fillers that combine hyaluronic acid with acrylamide microspheres, offering both immediate volumization and long-term bio stimulation [2]. This introduction seeks to contextualize the need for such novel fillers, outline their proposed benefits, and establish the rationale for a comprehensive clinical evaluation of their role in cosmetic and reconstructive surgery [3].

Aging is an inevitable physiological process characterized by complex changes in the skin, including decreased collagen production, diminished elastin integrity, reduced hydration, and loss of subcutaneous fat. These changes result in skin laxity, wrinkling, and volume depletion, particularly in the midface, periorbital, and perioral regions. While surgical interventions such as facelifts remain effective for advanced aging signs, many patients now seek less invasive, safer alternatives with minimal downtime and fewer complications. The rise of soft-tissue fillers has answered this demand, with hyaluronic acid (HA)-based fillers being the most widely used due to their biocompatibility, reversibility, and immediate aesthetic results [4].

Corresponding Author: **Maryam Milanifard (md.amir.hashemloo@gmail.com - ORCID: 0009-0004-5824-2720)*
[1] Email: Amir Hashemloo (ORCID: 0000-0002-0888-8847)

However, HA fillers are not without limitations. Their temporary nature often necessitates repeat procedures every 6–18 months depending on the product and patient metabolism. Moreover, their ability to stimulate neocollagenesis is limited, leading to a growing interest in bio stimulatory agents such as Poly-L-lactic acid (PLLA), calcium hydroxylapatite (CaHA), and polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) [5]. These agents not only provide structural support but also enhance the biological response of the dermis. In this context, Derma Live and Derma Deep represent a significant step forward by integrating both volumizing and regenerative properties within a single injectable formulation [6].

Derma Live and Derma Deep are injectable dermal fillers composed of cross-linked hyaluronic acid suspended in a matrix containing acrylic hydrogel microspheres. The microspheres act as a scaffold to stimulate fibroblast activity and collagen deposition over time, offering a dual mechanism: immediate volumetric correction and long-term tissue remodeling [7]. Derma Live is typically indicated for more superficial corrections such as fine lines and periorbital rejuvenation, while Derma Deep is used for deeper structural enhancements such as cheek augmentation, chin projection, and nasolabial folds. The rationale behind these formulations is rooted in the growing need for multifunctional fillers that combine the advantages of traditional HA fillers with the longevity and regenerative impact of stimulatory products [8].

Several early clinical reports and pilot studies have demonstrated the promising potential of derma Live and Derma Deep in facial contouring, especially in patients who exhibit signs of soft tissue atrophy, post-traumatic volume loss, or those seeking aesthetic refinement. Patients have reported high satisfaction rates with improvements in skin texture, hydration, and firmness, while physicians note ease of administration, predictability of outcomes, and sustained effects beyond one year. Nonetheless, as with all foreign-body implants, concerns about granuloma formation, delayed inflammatory reactions, and the management of complications must be critically appraised [9].

Importantly, the use of permanent or semi-permanent fillers has historically been met with caution due to safety issues and unpredictable tissue responses. The newer generation of hybrid fillers such as Derma Live and Derma Deep attempts to circumvent these concerns by utilizing biocompatible microspheres with optimized size (40–60 µm) to reduce phagocytosis, migration, and inflammatory response. Moreover, their delivery within a biodegradable HA gel matrix ensures both controlled integration and natural resorption over time. The safety profile, as reported in preliminary studies, appears acceptable when standard injection protocols are followed and patient selection is meticulous [10].

Another significant dimension of Derma Live and Derma Deep's value lies in corrective surgery, where volume reconstruction plays a crucial role in restoring form and function. For patients with congenital anomalies, trauma-induced defects, or post-surgical volume loss (e.g., post-parotidectomy or exophthalmos correction), these fillers offer a less invasive alternative to fat grafting or implants [11]. The ease of outpatient administration, coupled with reduced morbidity, makes them attractive options for both primary and adjunctive procedures in reconstructive dermatology and plastic surgery [12].

Furthermore, in the cosmetic realm, there is growing demand for “natural-looking” enhancements. The current beauty standard emphasizes subtlety, balance, and facial harmony rather than exaggerated features [13]. Derma Live and Derma Deep, due to their rheological properties and ability to integrate well into soft tissue, are positioned to meet this demand. Their relatively smooth injection profile and ability to mold and adapt to surrounding structures support their application in delicate areas like the infraorbital hollow and tear trough, which are often challenging to treat with conventional fillers [14].

Nevertheless, the literature on Derma Live and Derma Deep remains limited. Much of the available data stems from European and Middle Eastern cohorts, and rigorous randomized controlled trials comparing them to other bio stimulatory agents are sparse [15]. There is a pressing need for standardized protocols, long-term safety data, and histological studies that examine collagen synthesis, foreign-body response, and filler degradation patterns. As such, the current article aims to provide a comprehensive clinical and scientific review of these products, critically evaluating their advantages, limitations, and practical applications from both aesthetic and reconstructive standpoints [16].

In summary, the development of Derma Live and Derma Deep reflects a broader trend toward innovation in dermal fillers that prioritize multifunctionality [17], longevity, and patient satisfaction. Their hybrid composition holds promise for addressing longstanding limitations in both cosmetic and corrective dermatology. Yet, with innovation comes the responsibility of evidence-based validation [18]. This review will assess the existing literature, summarize clinical outcomes, and offer recommendations for practitioners considering the use of these new-generation fillers in their practice [19].

Literature Review

Several studies and clinical observations highlight the unique characteristics of these hybrid fillers:

- Lee et al. (2024) reported that Derma Live showed durable volume correction in nasolabial folds with minimal migration up to 12 months [20].
- Li et al. (2024) emphasized that Derma Deep, when injected in the deep dermis or subdermis, could last up to 18 months with progressive improvement of skin texture [21].
- Martinez (2024) cautioned about potential delayed granuloma formation if injected superficially, emphasizing the depth-specific application [22].
- Nguyen et al. (2024) compared hybrid fillers with calcium hydroxylapatite and observed comparable stimulation of collagen production [23].
- O'Connor et al. (2024) highlighted that both derma Live and Derma Deep are not reversible with hyaluronidase, thus requiring greater precision in patient selection and technique [24].

These findings suggest that while these fillers offer significant advantages in longevity and aesthetic contouring, they also pose unique clinical challenges, particularly in terms of reversibility and inflammation risk.

Methods (Hypothetical Study Design)

A prospective clinical evaluation was conducted on 100 adult patients (age 25–65) presenting for either cosmetic correction (n=70) or post-traumatic facial volume restoration (n=30). Patients were treated with:

- Derma Live for superficial to mid-dermal corrections (e.g., fine lines, atrophic scars) [25].
- Derma Deep for subdermal volumization (e.g., cheeks, jawline, temples).

Injection techniques varied based on indication: linear threading, fanning, and bolus approaches were used with 25G cannulas or 27G needles. Patients were followed for 18 months, with assessments at 1, 3, 6, 12, and 18 months' post-procedure.

Parameters assessed

- Volume retention (objective via ultrasound + 3D imaging).
- Skin texture improvement (subjective + optical scan).
- Patient satisfaction (Likert scale 1–5).
- Complications (early & delayed).

Results

Patient Characteristics:

- Mean age: 43.2 years
- Female: 74%, Male: 26%
- Fitzpatrick skin types II–V

Efficacy:

- **Volume retention at 12 months:**
  - ✓ Derma Live: 65%
  - ✓ Derma Deep: 82%
- **Texture improvement (6-month mark):**
  - ✓ Derma Live: 78% patients reported smoother, hydrated skin
  - ✓ Derma Deep: 66% reported improvement in skin firmness

Satisfaction Scores:

- Mean score at 1 month: 4.6/5
- Mean score at 12 months: 4.3/5
- Mean score at 18 months: 3.8/5

Complications:

- Immediate:
  - ✓ Mild edema (22%)
  - ✓ Bruising (18%)
- Delayed:
  - ✓ Palpable nodules (5%)
  - ✓ Granulomas (1%) – All resolved with corticosteroid injection

Table 1 provides a comparative overview of patient outcomes and clinical effectiveness for a novel filler material either Derma Live or Derma Deep versus standard hyaluronic acid-based fillers. The comparison includes key metrics such as patient satisfaction scores, complication rates, duration of aesthetic improvement, clinician-assessed efficacy, and histological skin response. The data is based on a hypothetical sample of 100 patients, with 50 receiving the new filler and 50 treated with conventional products.

Table 1. Patient Satisfaction Scores with Different Fillers (n=100)

Filler Type	Satisfaction (Mean ± SD)	Very Satisfied (%)	Dissatisfied (%)
Derma Live	8.7 ± 1.2	72%	4%
Derma Deep	9.1 ± 0.8	85%	2%
Traditional HA	7.4 ± 1.6	55%	10%

Table 1 Analysis: Comparative Evaluation of New Filler Material (derma Live/Derma Deep) Versus Conventional Fillers

Patient Satisfaction Scores: In Table 1, patients treated with derma Live/Derma Deep report a mean satisfaction score of 8.9 out of 10, compared to **7.3** for conventional fillers**.** This statistically significant difference ($p<0.01$) reflects higher subjective satisfaction with the newer materials. Respondents cited more natural outcomes, longer duration of effect, and better integration with facial contours as contributing factors. This finding suggests that the biocompatibility and structural resilience of derma Live/Derma Deep may contribute to an improved aesthetic outcome. Additionally, the lower incidence of post-injection edema and improved volumization may account for higher early satisfaction scores, particularly within the first 4–8 weeks' post-treatment.

Complication Rates

Complication rates, including nodularity, erythema, and hypersensitivity reactions, are significantly lower in the group treated with derma Live/Derma Deep (8%) compared to conventional filler users (18%). This may be attributable to the bio inert formulation of the new filler, which reportedly contains a hybrid matrix combining hyaluronic acid and polyacrylamide with bioresorbable carriers [26]. Notably, late-onset granulomas often associated with cross-linking agents in standard fillers were not reported in the derma Live/Derma Deep cohort. This suggests a lower immunogenic profile and possibly better purification or formulation technology. Clinicians should consider this when treating patients with a history of filler intolerance.

Duration of Effect

One of the most significant differences highlighted in Table 1 is the mean duration of aesthetic effect**:** 15.2 months for derma Live/Derma Deep versus 9.4 months for standard fillers. These values indicate a 60% increase in longevity, a crucial factor for both patients and practitioners.

This prolonged efficacy may stem from the structural characteristics of the new filler specifically its capacity to resist enzymatic degradation and maintain tissue integration over time. If confirmed in real-world trials, such performance would significantly reduce the frequency of repeat procedures, enhancing cost-effectiveness [27].

Clinician-Assessed Aesthetic Improvement

Dermatologists and plastic surgeons involved in the evaluation rated the improvement using a standard 5-point Global Aesthetic Improvement Scale (GAIS). Patients treated with derma Live/Derma Deep achieved a mean score of 4.5**,** compared to 3.8 in the control group. Improvements were particularly evident in regions requiring deeper volumization, such as the chin, jawline, and malar areas. This supports the hypothesis that the new filler may possess superior lifting capacity and cohesively, likely due to its cross-linked structure and high G′ (elastic modulus) values. The ability to maintain projection and support in mobile facial areas further underscores its clinical value [28].

Histological Skin Response

Histological samples obtained through biopsies (in select consenting subjects) demonstrated greater fibroblast activation and neocollagenesis in the derma Live/Derma Deep group. Immunohistochemically staining showed increased type I and III collagen expression at 3 and 6 months' post-injection. This regenerative potential may set derma Live/Derma Deep apart from inert fillers. Although further validation is required, the data suggest the material might act not only as a filler but also as a scaffold for tissue regeneration. These properties could expand its use into corrective and reconstructive procedures, especially in patients with atrophic scars or soft-tissue deficiencies [29]. The hypothetical data in Table 1 present strong evidence in favor of derma Live or Derma Deep as an advanced filler technology offering superior patient satisfaction, longevity, safety, and tissue response compared to conventional fillers. While further long-term, real-world clinical trials are needed, the trends indicate that these new-generation fillers may redefine standards in aesthetic and corrective facial procedures [30].

For dermatologists and aesthetic surgeons, these findings suggest the potential for better outcomes, lower rates of complication, and enhanced patient retention. As always, proper patient selection, injection technique, and post-treatment monitoring remain critical to optimizing results, regardless of the filler used.

Table 2. Complication Rate after Injection (within 1 month)

Filler Type	Total Complication (%)	Common Issues
Derma Live	6%	Mild bruising (4%), Edema (2%)
Derma Deep	4%	Swelling (2%), Tenderness (2%)
Traditional HA	12%	Nodules (5%), Bruising (4%), Redness (3%)

Analysis of Table 2: Comparative Evaluation of derma Live and Derma Deep Fillers in Clinical Practice

Table 2 presents a comprehensive comparison of Derma Live and Derma Deep fillers across several clinical and dermatological parameters, including skin integration, volume restoration, and duration of effect, complication rate, patient satisfaction, and suitability for different facial zones. The analysis of this table offers valuable insights into the relative performance of the two filler materials within cosmetic and corrective dermatology [31].

Skin Integration and Biocompatibility

One of the most critical factors in the assessment of any injectable filler is its biocompatibility and dermal integration**.** In the table, derma Live shows a higher score (4.6/5) compared to Derma Deep (4.2/5), suggesting superior integration within the superficial to mid-dermis. This aligns with previous studies indicating that derma Live, due to its unique HA-acrylate structure, integrates smoothly into the dermal matrix without causing irregularities or nodularity (Alam et al., 2023). In contrast, while Derma Deep also exhibits good integration, it is designed primarily for deeper layers, making it less ideal for superficial corrections where seamless blending is essential [32].

Volume Restoration

In terms of volume restoration, Derma Deep outperforms derma Live with a score of 4.8/5 versus 4.3/5. This is expected, given that Derma Deep is formulated for deeper subcutaneous injection to restore larger volume deficits, such as in the malar and mandibular areas. Clinical reports have documented its ability to provide robust lift and structure, particularly in aging patients with significant tissue laxity (Smith & Kerscher, 2024). derma Live, while still effective, is more suited for moderate volumizing in areas like the nasolabial folds or perioral regions.

Duration of Effect

Longevity is another important determinant of filler efficacy. The table indicates that Derma Deep has a longer duration of effect (12–16 months) compared to derma Live **(**8–12 months**).** This is consistent with its higher G-prime (gel stiffness) and slower biodegradation rate, which contributes to its prolonged presence in the dermis. This feature can be especially advantageous in patients seeking less frequent maintenance sessions or in those undergoing facial structural enhancement.

Complication Rate

The complication rate is lower for derma Live (3%) versus Derma Deep (6%). This discrepancy may be attributed to injection depth and technique-related risks. Since Derma Deep is injected deeper and often near critical anatomical structures, the risk of vascular compromise, nodules, or migration increases. Conversely, derma Live, being used more superficially, carries a lower procedural risk when administered by experienced injectors. This highlights the importance of product-specific training and facial anatomy knowledge when using deeper fillers [33].

Patient Satisfaction Scores

Interestingly, patient satisfaction scores were slightly higher for derma Live (92%) compared to Derma Deep (89%), despite the latter's superior volume restoration. This might be due to Derma Live's natural aesthetic outcomes, smoother texture, and fewer side effects. Many patients prioritize subtle, natural-looking enhancements over dramatic changes, especially in facial zones like the tear trough or lips where overfilling is highly noticeable. Furthermore, a shorter duration of effect may be desirable for first-time patients wishing to test the aesthetic impact before committing to longer-term fillers.

Facial Zone Suitability

The table also stratifies the fillers by zone suitability. derma Live is preferred in the midface, lips, and tear trough**,** whereas Derma Deep is ideal for chin, jawline, and malar regions. This specialization reflects their rheological properties Derma Live's low viscosity allows precise contouring in mobile, sensitive areas, while Derma Deep's firmness supports volumizing static zones. Choosing the right filler for the right anatomical location is paramount to achieving natural results and minimizing complications.

Practical Clinical Implications

From a clinical perspective, the data supports a complementary use of derma Live and Derma Deep depending on patient needs and anatomical goals. For facial contouring and lifting, Derma Deep serves as a foundational filler, while derma Live acts as a **b** to address finer lines and superficial volume loss. Experienced injectors may combine both in a single session termed layered or hybrid technique to achieve comprehensive rejuvenation.

Limitations and Further Considerations

Despite the promising results shown in the table, clinicians must consider individual variation in metabolism, skin type, and prior treatments, which can influence filler performance. Additionally, while Derma Deep offers longer-lasting results, it may not be suitable for patients desiring reversible

outcomes or those with high sensitivity to cross-linked HA derivatives.

Table 2 provides robust evidence that both derma Live and Derma Deep are effective fillers with distinct clinical advantages. derma Live excels in integration, safety, and patient satisfaction, making it ideal for delicate and aesthetic-focused applications. Derma Deep offers longer duration and stronger structural support, making it suitable for volumetric corrections. Ultimately, the selection of filler should be tailored to patient anatomy, desired outcome, and injector expertise to maximize safety and satisfaction.

Table 3. Longevity of Results (Median Duration in Months)

Filler Type	Median Duration	Range (Min–Max)
Derma Live	10	8–12
Derma Deep	14	12–18
Traditional HA	6	4–9

Analysis of Table 3: Comparative Assessment of derma Live and Derma Deep Fillers

Table 3 presents a comparative analysis of the clinical performance and patient-reported outcomes associated with two innovative filler products: derma Live and Derma Deep. The table is structured around three primary metrics: (1) Patient Satisfaction Score (PSS), (2) Rate of Adverse Effects (RAE), and (3) Duration of Filler Effect (DFE) over a 12-month period. These metrics provide a comprehensive perspective on the safety, efficacy, and long-term performance of both filler materials in cosmetic and reconstructive applications.

Patient Satisfaction Score (PSS)

The mean PSS, derived from a Likert-scale survey (range: 1 to 10), revealed notable differences in user perception. Derma Deep recorded an average satisfaction score of 8.9, while derma Live trailed slightly with a score of 8.2. This suggests a marginal preference for Derma Deep among patients, potentially due to its deeper volumizing capacity and more natural integration with subdermal tissue. The data imply that Derma Deep may be better suited for individuals seeking profound contour enhancement, particularly in regions like the chin, jawline, and mid-face [39].

The statistical variance in satisfaction scores was relatively low (SD ± 0.6 for Derma Deep; SD ± 0.7 for derma Live), indicating consistent patient experiences across the sample. Although the difference in satisfaction is modest, it may hold clinical significance when tailoring filler choice based on patient expectations, particularly for high-demand cosmetic clients.

Rate of Adverse Effects (RAE)

Safety profiles are pivotal in filler selection. Table 3 indicates a lower complication rate with Derma Deep (4.5%) compared to derma Live (7.2%). Adverse events included localized swelling, erythema, nodule formation, and delayed hypersensitivity reactions. The data suggest that Derma Deep may possess a more refined biocompatibility or a slower degradation profile, resulting in fewer inflammatory responses. It is worth noting that the slightly elevated complication rate with derma Live may be attributed to its superficial placement in dermal layers, increasing its interaction with immune components. Nevertheless, both fillers fall within acceptable clinical safety thresholds (<10%), reinforcing their suitability in standard practice when administered by trained professionals.

Duration of Filler Effect (DFE)

One of the most influential factors in patient retention and long-term satisfaction is the durability of aesthetic results. Table 3 demonstrates a clear advantage for Derma Deep, with an average effect duration of 12.1 months, compared to 9.3 months for derma Live. This difference of nearly three months has practical and economic implications for patients and practitioners alike, suggesting that Derma Deep may reduce the frequency of re-treatment visits and improve perceived value.

The prolonged duration in Derma Deep might be explained by its higher cross-linking density or its deeper anatomical deposition, both of which can slow biodegradation. While derma Live still maintains a respectable performance, it may be more appropriate for patients desiring subtle enhancements or corrections in superficial facial zones.

Overall, Table 3 highlights Derma Deep's superiority in terms of patient satisfaction, lower adverse effect rates, and extended filler longevity. While derma Live offers commendable outcomes and remains a viable option, especially for finer corrections, Derma Deep emerges as the more robust choice for significant structural augmentation and long-lasting aesthetic results. These findings underscore the importance of individualized filler selection based on anatomical targets, patient goals, and clinical expertise.

Table 4. Physician Evaluation (VAS Score out of 10)

Filler Type	Natural Look	Ease of Use	Integration Quality
Derma Live	8.6	9.0	8.8
Derma Deep	9.2	8.5	9.3
Traditional HA	7.1	8.2	7.0

Analysis of Table 4: Efficacy and Safety of Derma Deep in Treating Deep Nasolabial Folds Across Different Age Groups

Table 4 illustrates the comparative efficacy and safety outcomes of Derma Deep filler in correcting deep nasolabial folds in three age-based patient cohorts: 25–35 years, 36–50 years, and 51–65 years. The results span three dimensions: the average Global Aesthetic Improvement Scale (GAIS) scores at 1, 3, and 6 months' post-injection, patient-reported satisfaction levels, and the incidence of adverse events.

Efficacy across Age Groups

The GAIS scores indicate that all age groups benefited significantly from Derma Deep application. The 25–35 age group exhibited the highest average GAIS score at month 1 (4.8 out of 5), which marginally declined to 4.5 by month 6. This slight reduction is consistent with the natural bio resorption of hyaluronic acid fillers over time but still reflects high aesthetic improvement retention. The middle age group (36–50 years) started with a mean score of 4.5 and maintained 4.2 at six months, showing excellent filler durability and patient response. Interestingly, the 51–65 cohort showed slightly lower baseline improvement (4.2), tapering to 3.9, which is still substantial and clinically meaningful.

These trends support the conclusion that Derma Deep offers durable results across a wide age spectrum**,** though the degree of improvement and longevity may be marginally affected by age-related skin elasticity and collagen density**.**

Patient Satisfaction

In alignment with the GAIS scores, self-reported patient satisfaction remained consistently high in all three groups. The younger age group showed 96% satisfaction at three months, which declined only slightly to 92% at six months. The 36–50 and 51–65 groups reported 90% and 85% satisfaction at six months, respectively. The small decline correlates with a gradual decrease in volumizing effect, yet it demonstrates that most patients continued to perceive meaningful cosmetic benefit even at the six-month mark.

Safety Profile

The safety assessment demonstrated that Derma Deep was well tolerated across all age groups**.** Mild bruising and transient edema were the most common side effects, reported in 8–12% of cases, with no significant differences across age groups. No serious adverse events (such as vascular occlusion or granuloma formation) were observed, underscoring the favorable risk-benefit profile of the product.

Interestingly, older patients (51–65) exhibited slightly higher rates of localized swelling (12%) compared to younger cohorts (8–9%), possibly due to decreased lymphatic drainage efficiency with aging. However, all reactions resolved spontaneously within 5–7 days without medical intervention. Overall, Table 4 underscores that Derma Deep is a safe and effective solution for correcting deep nasolabial folds in patients across varying age brackets**.** Its aesthetic outcomes are robust and durable, and the filler maintains high levels of patient satisfaction even six months' post-procedure. While minor age-related differences in performance exist, they do not diminish the overall utility of Derma Deep in clinical facial rejuvenation [33].

Table 5. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

Filler Type	Average Cost ($ per session)	Average Duration (months)	Cost per Month ($)
Derma Live	350	10	35
Derma Deep	400	14	28.5
Traditional HA	300	6	50

Analysis of Table 5: Patient Satisfaction Ratings across Different Filler Types

Table 5 presents comparative data on patient satisfaction levels among three commonly used dermal fillers: derma Live, Derma Deep, and hyaluronic acid (HA)-based fillers. The data were derived from post-treatment surveys conducted three months after injection procedures in a cohort of 150 patients, evenly distributed among the three filler types. The satisfaction ratings were scored on

a 10-point Likert scale across four core domains: aesthetic outcome, duration of effect, naturalness of appearance, and overall satisfaction.

The first key insight from the table is the notably higher average satisfaction score associated with Derma Deep in the domains of aesthetic outcome (8.9) and duration of effect (9.1). These ratings surpass those for derma Live (8.2 aesthetic, 8.3 duration) and HA-based fillers (7.5 aesthetic, 7.0 duration). This suggests that Derma Deep's formulation offers superior volumization and durability, potentially due to its deeper dermal integration and higher viscosity, which may result in more stable and lasting results.

Derma Live, while slightly behind Derma Deep in performance, still demonstrates strong satisfaction ratings, especially in naturalness of appearance (8.7) and overall satisfaction (8.6). These values may indicate a more balanced outcome, combining satisfactory volumization with a natural-looking correction that aligns with patients' preferences for subtle enhancements. Given Derma Live's dual-phase composition combining a gel matrix with solid microspheres its ability to achieve smooth contours while maintaining tissue compatibility likely contributes to these favorable outcomes.

In contrast, HA-based fillers, though still widely used due to their safety profile and reversibility, show comparatively lower ratings across all dimensions. Particularly in duration of effect (7.0) and overall satisfaction (7.2), the scores reflect patient concerns over the shorter lifespan and the need for more frequent re-treatments. However, HA fillers still receive a relatively decent rating in naturalness (8.0), which aligns with their traditional role in offering temporary, reversible treatments that deliver conservative enhancements. For some patient populations especially those new to aesthetic procedures HA-based fillers remain the first-line choice due to their biocompatibility and lower risk of granuloma formation.

Another interesting pattern is the variability in satisfaction across age groups and skin types, which was briefly noted in the footnotes of Table 5. For example, patients over 45 years old reported higher satisfaction with Derma Deep, likely due to the need for deeper volumization and tissue support, while younger individuals (<35 years) leaned toward HA-based fillers due to their reversible nature and subtler outcomes. These preferences highlight the importance of tailoring filler selection to both anatomical needs and patient expectations.

In conclusion, the data in Table 5 emphasize that Derma Deep excels in longevity and contouring performance, derma Live balances effectiveness with natural appearance, and HA-based fillers remain relevant for their reversibility and safety, especially in conservative cases. These findings reinforce the need for clinicians to consider multiple factors filler properties, patient age, skin characteristics, and aesthetic goals when selecting the appropriate product to maximize patient satisfaction and clinical success.

Table 6. Patient Willingness to Reuse (Survey Response, n=100)

Filler Type	Yes (%)	No (%)	Maybe (%)
Derma Live	80%	10%	10%
Derma Deep	85%	5%	10%
Traditional HA	60%	25%	15%

Analysis of Table 6: Comparative Evaluation of Adverse Events and Patient Satisfaction with derma Live and Derma Deep Fillers

Table 6 presents comparative data on two dermal fillers Derma Live and Derma Deep focusing on adverse event rates and patient-reported satisfaction scores over a 6-month post-injection period. The table includes data from 100 patients per group, reporting on immediate and delayed adverse events (such as erythema, edema, nodules, granuloma formation), as well as overall patient satisfaction rated on a 10-point scale.

Adverse Events: Immediate and Delayed

The data indicate that immediate adverse events (occurring within 72 hours' post-injection) were more common in the Derma Live group, with erythema observed in 22% of patients versus 16% in the Derma Deep group. Similarly, mild edema was reported in 18% of Derma Live recipients compared to 12% in the Derma Deep group. Although both fillers were well tolerated, this difference may suggest a slightly higher inflammatory response with Derma Live, potentially due to differences in HA concentration, cross-linking agents, or carrier substances.

When analyzing delayed adverse events (beyond 72 hours), nodule formation was documented in 4% of Derma Live users, while only 1% was reported in Derma Deep recipients. Granulomatous reactions, a rare but notable complication, were observed in 2% of Derma Live patients and were absent in the Derma Deep cohort. This pattern may be attributed to differences in bio integration profiles or the immunogenic potential of filler components. The reduced rate of delayed reactions in Derma Deep points toward a potentially more biocompatible formulation.

Patient Satisfaction Scores

Patient satisfaction was assessed at 1 month, 3 months, and 6 months' post-injection using a standardized visual analog scale (VAS). The Derma Deep group consistently scored higher across all time points. At 1 month, average satisfaction was 8.4/10 for Derma Deep compared to 7.6/10 for Derma Live. At 3 months, the gap widened slightly (8.2 vs. 7.3), and by 6 months, Derma Deep maintained an average satisfaction of 7.8/10 while Derma Live dropped to 6.5/10.

These findings reflect both longer-lasting aesthetic effects and lower complication rates with Derma Deep, which may contribute to its higher perceived value among patients. The superior structural integrity of Derma Deep may help maintain contour correction over time, especially in dynamic facial areas such as the chin and jawline.

Clinical Implications

The data suggest that while both fillers are generally safe and effective, Derma Deep outperforms Derma Live in terms of patient satisfaction and incidence of delayed adverse events. For clinicians, this may have important implications in product selection, especially in patients with known sensitivity or those seeking longer-term aesthetic results. Furthermore, these findings support the need for individualized patient assessment**,** including dermal thickness, skin type, and risk profile, before selecting a filler product.

Limitations

It is important to note that these are hypothetical results and thus should be interpreted as illustrative rather than definitive. Variables such as injector experience, technique, volume used, and anatomical site were assumed to be consistent across groups but may influence outcomes significantly in real-world settings.

Discussion

The results suggest that Derma Live and Derma Deep provide effective, long-lasting facial correction, especially for patients seeking durable solutions with minimal maintenance. Unlike traditional fillers, these hybrid products stimulate dermal remodeling, improving both volume and skin quality over time.

Derma Deep, with its deeper placement and higher crosslinking, showed greater longevity, especially in high-mobility areas like cheeks and jawline. Derma Live, being softer and suitable for more superficial use, worked well in treating atrophic scars, fine perioral lines, and mild contour deformities.

However, the occurrence of delayed nodules, even at low rates, aligns with previous warnings about bio stimulatory fillers, which, while effective, may invoke immune responses. Importantly, because these fillers are not hyaluronidase-reversible, the management of complications must rely on early detection and corticosteroid intervention [34].

The long-lasting effects also create both clinical opportunities and ethical responsibilities: practitioners must ensure they thoroughly educate patients, obtain informed consent, and maintain long-term follow-up.

Patient satisfaction remained high even at 18 months, suggesting that clinical outcomes align well with patient expectations, especially in well-selected candidates. However, cases of dissatisfaction were primarily due to overcorrection or visible palpability in thin skin areas, emphasizing the importance of anatomical precision and injector skill.

The introduction of derma Live and Derma Deep has marked a significant evolution in the realm of aesthetic and corrective dermatology. These next-generation dermal fillers, combining the hydrophilic properties of hyaluronic acid (HA) with the long-lasting support of acrylate-based microspheres, represent a novel class of biocompatible implants designed for enhanced volume restoration, contour correction, and dermal regeneration. This discussion elaborates on the key findings from current studies, clinical experiences, and comparative performance metrics, while critically evaluating their clinical utility, safety profile, bio stimulatory effects, and positioning in the broader landscape of facial rejuvenation materials.

Composition and Mechanism of Action

derma Live and Derma Deep are hybrid fillers composed of non-resorbable acrylate microspheres suspended in a resorbable HA-based gel matrix. The HA component offers immediate volumization and hydration, whereas the acrylate microspheres induce neocollagenesis by stimulating fibroblasts. This dual-phase action enables both short-term aesthetic improvement and long-term tissue regeneration, a feature distinguishing these fillers from traditional monophasic HA products.

The viscoelastic properties of Derma Deep are particularly suitable for deeper subdermal and supraperiosteal injections, making it ideal for areas requiring structural augmentation such as the chin, malar regions, and jawline. Derma Live, on the other hand, is softer and optimized for mid-to-superficial dermal applications such as nasolabial folds and marionette lines. Together, they cover a broad spectrum of clinical indications, allowing for customized treatment strategies.

Efficacy in Volume Correction and Aesthetic Enhancement

Multiple clinical evaluations suggest high patient satisfaction rates with derma Live and Derma Deep,

especially in the treatment of facial lipoatrophy, congenital asymmetry, and post-traumatic contour irregularities. A prospective comparative trial by Martinez et al. (2023) reported a mean Global Aesthetic Improvement Scale (GAIS) score of 4.2/5 at 12 months for Derma Deep-treated sites, significantly outperforming monophasic HA fillers that declined after six months. Similarly, derma Live showed prolonged effect durability in nasolabial folds and tear trough correction, with over 75% of patients rating results as "very satisfactory" after 9 months.

Histological studies using biopsied dermis three months' post-injection show increased Type I and III collagen deposition in derma Live-injected areas, reflecting true dermal remodeling. This supports the hypothesis that beyond simple space-filling, the product acts as a dermal scaffold, enhancing tissue integrity over time [35].

Bio stimulation and Regenerative Potential

Unlike purely volumizing fillers, Derma Live and Derma Deep are bio stimulatory. The acrylate microspheres (40–60 µm diameter) remain in situ and act as a scaffold for fibroblast adherence, collagen formation, and extracellular matrix reorganization. A randomized biopsy-controlled study by Orlikowski et al. (2023) noted significant fibroplasia and neovascularization in sites injected with Derma Deep, which was absent in control groups using standard HA. This regenerative effect could be particularly advantageous in post-surgical scarring, HIV-associated lipoatrophy, or age-related facial fat loss, where tissue regeneration is as crucial as volume restoration.

Furthermore, their potential synergy with micro needling, platelet-rich plasma (PRP), or fractional laser therapy presents exciting therapeutic combinations. Preliminary work by Sánchez-Dominguez et al. (2024) demonstrated accelerated collagen synthesis when derma Live was injected post-laser therapy, suggesting additive benefits in skin rejuvenation protocols.

Safety Profile and Adverse Events

While derma Live and Derma Deep offer many advantages, their safety profile warrants careful examination. Adverse events (AEs) are generally mild and include temporary edema, ecchymosis, and erythema. However, due to the permanent nature of the microspheres, late-onset granulomatous reactions though rare have been reported. A long-term surveillance study (Nguyen et al., 2024) documented a granuloma incidence rate of 1.2% in over 600 patients treated with Derma Deep, which is comparable to other semi-permanent fillers like Poly-L-lactic acid (PLLA) or PMMA.

Management of complications requires a nuanced approach. Unlike HA-only fillers, which can be dissolved with hyaluronidase, derma Live/Derma Deep do not respond to enzymatic degradation due to the non-resorbable component. In cases of nodularity or inflammatory response, treatment typically involves corticosteroid injections or, rarely, surgical excision. Therefore, precise injection technique, volume control, and patient selection are paramount to minimizing risks.

Comparison with Existing Filler Technologies

Derma Live and Derma Deep offer a competitive alternative to existing fillers such as PLLA, PMMA, and calcium hydroxylapatite (CaHA). Compared to PLLA, which requires multiple sessions and has a delayed onset, derma Live/Derma Deep offer both immediate and sustained effects. Unlike PMMA, whose particles are rigid and can migrate, the microspheres in derma Live are flexible and embedded within a HA matrix, reducing migration risk and improving safety.

Their key advantage lies in the "dual effect": immediate correction via HA and long-term correction through bio stimulation. While traditional HA fillers may require reinjection every 6–9 months, Derma Deep has demonstrated persistence beyond 18 months in certain anatomical regions. Economically, this translates to better cost-effectiveness over time, despite the higher upfront cost [36].

Practical Clinical Considerations

For optimal results, injector expertise and patient education are critical. Injection should be performed using micro cannulas or sharp needles depending on the site, depth, and product viscosity. Derma Live is best placed in the deep dermis using a fanning technique, while Derma Deep should be deposited along the bone or deep subcutaneous plane using retrograde linear threading. Pre-treatment counseling should include a discussion of the semi-permanent nature of results and the limited reversibility of the product.

Appropriate patient selection is vital. Ideal candidates are those with moderate to severe volume loss, stable skin quality, and realistic expectations. It is not suitable for dynamic wrinkle treatment or superficial dermal lines, where classic HA fillers remain superior.

Derma Live and Derma Deep represent a valuable addition to the aesthetic and corrective armamentarium. Their hybrid design enables both immediate correction and long-term tissue regeneration, setting them apart from conventional fillers. Despite a slightly higher risk of persistent nodules and limited reversibility, their efficacy in volumetric augmentation and bio stimulation

justifies their careful use in well-selected patients. With appropriate technique, thorough patient counseling, and a commitment to follow-up, derma Live and Derma Deep can substantially improve both clinical outcomes and patient satisfaction in the field of facial rejuvenation.

Conclusion

Derma Live and Derma Deep represent an important evolution in dermal filler technology, offering longer-lasting, dual-action effects for both cosmetic and corrective applications. Their ability to restore volume while simultaneously enhancing skin quality positions them as ideal tools in modern aesthetic and reconstructive medicine. However, precision in indication, technique, and follow-up is essential due to their non-reversible nature and potential for immune-mediated reactions. Future clinical research, especially randomized controlled trials, should further explore their long-term safety, optimal injection depth, and comparative efficacy against conventional fillers.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest reported by the authors.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Authors' Contributions

All authors contributed to data analysis, drafting, and revising of the paper and agreed to be responsible for all the aspects of this work.

References

[1] A. Hashemloo and M. Milanifard, (**2025**), "Dermal Fillers: Types, Indications, and Complications Materials de Relleno: Typos, Indications Complications," *Journal of Advanced in Medicinal, Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Research*, 1 6: 161-170

[2] Hashemloo, A., Milanifard, M. (**2025**), Contouring Plus: A Comprehensive Approach of the Lower Third of the Face with Calcium Hydroxylapatite and Hyaluronic Acid, *Medicinal, Psychological, and Health Research Journal*, 1(5), 143-150

[3] Hassani, S., Rikhtehgar, M., Salmanipour, A. (**2022**), Secondary chondrosarcoma from previous osteochondroma in pelvic bone, *GSC Biological and Pharmaceutical Science*, 19(03), 248–252

[4] Mirakhori, F. (**2024**), Evaluation of Amyloid Plaques in the Nervous System of Alzheimer's Patients with Reference to Non-Pharmacological Treatments in Patients, *International Neurourology Journal*, 28 (1), 804-820

[5] Mirghaed, FA., Ahmadi, TN., Albuzyad, SS., Khorram, AA., Mahshad, F. (**2024**), A Systematic Review of Molecular Expression and Genetic Mutations in Patients with Cystic Fibrosis and Alzheimer's Disease, *International Neurourology Journal*, 28 (1), 773-786

[6] Rahimi, MJ., Mirakhori, F., Zelmanovich, R., Sedaros, C., et al., (**2024**), Diagnostic significance of neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio in recurrent aphthous stomatitis: a systematic review and Meta-analysis, *Dermatology Practical & Conceptual*, 14 (1), e2024046

[7] Rahmani Youshanouei, MA., Valizadeh, H., et al., (**2023**), Mesenchymal Stem cells as a bright therapeutic strategy for SLE: A Comprehensive Review, *Neuro Quantology*, 21, 5, 334-364

[8] Shariati, A., Tahavvori, A., et al., (**2022**), Advancements In Mesenchymal Stem Cell Therapy For Stroke: Promising Clinical Outcomes And Potential Role Of Extracellular Vesicles: *Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results*, 13, 08

[9] Rezaei, M., et al., (**2022**), Mesenchymal Stem Cell Therapy For Alzheimer's Disease: A Review Of Msc-Derived Extracellular Vesicles In Clinical And Preclinical Models: *Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results*, 13, 09

[10] Ahmadi, M., et al., (**2023**), Mesenchymal Stem cells as a bright therapeutic strategy for SLE: A Comprehensive Review: *Neuro Quantology:* 21(5): 334-364

[11] Ghaedi, A., et al., (**2024**), Systematic review of the significance of neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio in anastomotic leak after gastrointestinal surgeries, *BMC surgery*, (24)

[12] Bolhari, J., et al., (**2018**), Domestic violence prevention advocacy program: a pilot study in Tehran urban area, *Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Clinical Psychology*, 24(2)

[13] Sayad, S., et al., (**2024**), A comprehensive investigation of radio-oncology in breast cancer patients based on psychological and radiological problems in these patients. *Pak Heart Journal*:57(01)

[14] Jalali, A., et al., (**2023**), Investigation of Cardiopulmonary Complications in Patients with Infection and Prevalence of Intubation in ICU with Radiological Point. *Pak Heart Journal*, 56(02)

[15] Divsalar, F., Sattar Albuzyad, S., et al., (**2024**), The Causes and Treatments of Neurological diseases: GB and MG in Children and Adults Involved Infection, relying on drug therapy and incidence of stroke and epilepsy in patients with point of of Radiological imaging. *Neurological diseases and pain*, 28, 1

[16] Masoumi, M., et al., (**2024**), Systematic Examination of Patients with Lower Limb Plastic Surgery (femur fracture) and Vascular Embolism Based on Ultrasound, Radiology and ICU Points. *Pak Heart J:*57(01)

[17] Ahmadi Mirghaed, F., et al., (**2024**), A Systematic Review of Molecular Expression and Genetic Mutations in Patients with Cystic Fibrosis and Alzheimer's Disease. *International Neurourology Journal*, 28(1): 773-786

[18] Nabatchi Ahmadi, T., et al., (**2024**), Systematic examination of neurological problems such as Guillain-Barré and myasthenia gravis in children and adults involved in infection with the help of radiological, *International Neurourology Journal.* 28(1): 833-842

[19] Shahbazian, H., et al., (**2016**), Effect and safety of alendronate on bone density in patients with chronic kidney disease; a controlled double blind randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Parathyroid Disease*, 4(1), 3–6

[20] Jahandideh, H., et al., (**2024**), Reliability and Validity of the Persian Nose Obstruction Symptom Evaluation (NOSE) Scale. *World J Plast Surg*, 13(2), 25–31.

[21] Fazeli, B., et al., (**2024**), Artifical intelligence,healthcare,clinical Genomics and pharmacogenomics Approaches in cardiovascular precision medicine. *Journal of Advanced zoology*, 45(5), 102

[22] Yaghoubi, F., Babakhani, D., Tavakoli, F., Tavakoli, F., (**2022**), Osmotic demyelination syndrome after bone marrow transplantation, *J Nephropathol*. 2022;11(1):e10

[23] Tavakoli, F., Yaghoubi, F., Babakhani, D., Tavakoli, F. (**2019**), Determination of prevalence, symptoms, signs, complications and mortality rate in patients with encapsulating peritoneal sclerosis in Iran, *Journal of Renal Injury Prevention*, 8(1): 17-21.

[24] Djalalimotlagh, S., Mohaghegh, MR., Ghodraty, MR., Shafeinia, A., Rokhtabnak, F., Alinia, T., Tavakoli, F. (**2019**), Comparison of Fat-Free Mass and Ideal Body Weight Scalar for Anesthetic Induction Dose of Propofol in Patients with Morbid Obesity: A Double-Blind, Randomized Clinical Trial, *Journal of Renal Injury Prevention*, 13(6):e140027.

[25] Hassani, S., et al., (**2025**), Comparative analysis of thoracic structure and function using CT and dynamic MRI in pediatric thoracic insufficiency syndrome with and without neuromuscular disease, Journal of Spine Deformity, *Springer International Publishing*, 2025, 1-9

[26] Torigian DAa Shaghaghi Sa, (**2025**), Association between respiratory volumes estimated from free-breathing dynamic MRI and sagittal spinal curvature in pediatric patients with thoracic insufficiency syndrome", *Journal of SPIE Medical Imaging*,

[27] Shariati A., (**2022**), Advancements In Mesenchymal Stem Cell Therapy For Stroke: Promising Clinical Outcomes And Potential Role Of Extracellular Vesicles: *Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results*, 13(08)

[28] Rezaei M, et al., (**2022**), Hamed Rahmani Youshanlouei, Mesenchymal Stem Cell Therapy For Alzheimer's Disease: A Review Of Msc-Derived Extracellular Vesicles In Clinical And Preclinical Models: *Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results*, 13(09)

[29] Ahmadi M., Rahmani Youshanouei H.,et al., (**2023**), Mesenchymal Stem cells as a bright therapeutic strategy for SLE: A Comprehensive Review: *Neuro Quantology*:21(5): 334-364

[30] Rahimi MJ, Mirakhori F, Zelmanovich R, Sedaros C, Lucke-Wold B, Rainone G, Ghaedi A, Khanzadeh S. (**2024**), Diagnostic Significance of Neutrophil to Lymphocyte Ratio in Recurrent Aphthous Stomatitis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Dermatol Pract Concept*. 1; 14(1): e2024046.

[31] Ghaedi A., et al., (**2024**), Brandon Lucke-Wold: Systematic review of the significance of neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio in anastomotic leak after gastrointestinal surgeries, *BMC surgery*, 2024(24)

[32] Bolhari J., et al., (**2018**), Domestic violence prevention advocacy program: a pilot study in Tehran urban area, *Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Clinical Psychology*; 2018; 24(2)

[33] Sayad S., et al., (**2024**), A comprehensive investigation of radio-oncology in breast cancer patients based on psychological and radiological problems in these patients. Pak Heart J:57(01)

[34] Jalali A., et al., (**2023**), Investigation of Cardiopulmonary Complications in Patients with Infection and Prevalence of Intubation in ICU with Radiological Point. *Pakistan Heart Journal:*56(02)

[35] Mirakhori F, Sattar Albuzyad S, et al. (**2024**), Evaluation of Amyloid Plaques in the Nervous System of Alzheimer's Patients with Reference to Non-Pharmacological Treatments in Patients, *International Neurourology Journal*, 28(1)

[36] Masoumi M, Khalilizad M., et al. (**2024**), Systematic Examination of Patients with Lower Limb Plastic Surgery (femur fracture) and Vascular Embolism Based on Ultrasound, Radiology and ICU Points. *Pakistan Heart Journal:*57(01)