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ABSTRACT

Background: Rosacea is a common and complex chronic inflammatory skin disorder, the pathophysiology and etiology of which remain unclear. Recently, significant new insights into rosacea pathogenesis have enriched and reshaped our understanding of the disorder. A systematic analysis based on current studies will facilitate further research on rosacea pathogenesis.

Objective: To establish an international core outcome and knowledge system of rosacea pathogenesis and develop a challenge, trend and hot spot analysis set for research and clinical studies on rosacea using bibliometric analysis and data mining.

Methods: A search of the WoS, and PubMed, MEDLINE, Embase and Cochrane collaboration databases was conducted to perform visual bibliometric and data analysis.

Results: A total of 2,654 studies were used for the visualization and 302 of the 6,769 outcomes for data analysis. It reveals an increased trend line in the field of rosacea, in which its fast-growing pathogenesis attracted attention closely related to risk, comorbidity and therapeutic strategies. The rosacea pathogenesis has undergone the great development on immunology, microorganisms, genes, skin barriers and neurogenetics. The major of studies have
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1. Introduction

Rosacea is a complex chronic inflammatory facial skin disease that can have an adverse effect on the quality of life for people worldwide. The prevalence of rosacea among people worldwide peaks as high as 18% \([1, 2]\) with estimates as high as 40 million cases, mostly in people aged between 30 and 50 \([3, 4]\). Rosacea primarily affects the cheeks, nose, chin, and forehead with transient or persistent facial erythema, telangiectasia, papules, pustules, and recurrent flushing \([5]\). These pathological changes can lead to significant physical and mental discomfort, such as disfiguring manifestations, loss of sight in ocular rosacea, embarrassment, low self-esteem, and social phobia. Therefore, there is an urgent need for global research to develop better and more comprehensive management of rosacea, including its pathogenesis, risk factors, comorbidities, and treatment.

Although the etiology of rosacea is poorly understood, genetic factors, neurogenic dysregulation, immune systems dysregulation, microorganisms, barrier function impairment, and inflammatory response may play a major role in the development of rosacea \([6, 7, 8]\). In addition, a series of risk factors, comorbidities and specific treatments have also provided supplementary evidence for rosacea pathogenesis. For example, triggers that exacerbate the disorder (e.g., heat, stress) may suggest a neurogenic relationship with rosacea \([7]\). And a significant association with psychiatric, neurological, metabolic and gastrointestinal diseases of rosacea are closely related to neurogenic dysregulation and microorganisms \([9, 10]\). Based on these findings, various advancements in the rosacea pathogenesis system have been made.

Recognizing and addressing the pathogenesis system are critical to improve the outcomes of rosacea management \([11]\). However, updated and systematic data on the rosacea's pathogenesis are still relatively sparse, which has not been thoroughly evaluated through comprehensive evidence or even through information on risks, comorbidities and treatments. Moreover, the development, research emphasis, challenges and prospects of rosacea research have been poor to date. Thus, the aim of this article was to establish a knowledge system of rosacea's pathogenesis system through a series of comprehensive studies. Notably, we also performed a trend analysis and insight setting for the guidelines on rosacea research and clinical study according to the pathogenesis system. Meanwhile, the noted management is highlighted for patients with rosacea.

2. Data and methods

2.1. Data strategy and selection criteria for bibliometric study

Literature data for this bibliometrics study were retrieved from the Web of Science (WoS) Core Collection. The WoS Core Collection contains several important index types, including Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE), Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) and Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI). For a more comprehensive search of evidence on rosacea pathogenesis, we performed a thorough search and then manual classification to avoid missing information.

To perform a systematic analysis of rosacea, we chose articles, reviews and letters for inclusion in a visualization analysis. The terms ‘Rosacea’ and ‘Pathogenesis’ were used in the MeSH (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/) search, whereas ‘Rosacea’ and ‘Pathogenesis’ were represented by other expressions, such as ‘Rhinophyma’ and ‘etiology’, respectively. The search strategy used was as follows (TS=(rosacea) OR TS=(Rhinophyma)) AND (LA=(“ENGLISH”)) AND (DT=(“ARTICLE” OR “REVIEW” OR “LETTER”)); AND WEB OF SCIENCE INDEX (WOS. SCI), and time span of 1992-01-01 to 2022-01-01 (Figure 1).

2.2. Data strategy and inclusion/exclusion criteria for data mining

We used a systematic approach to search the following databases: PubMed, MEDLINE, Embase and Cochrane collaboration databases with the search terms ‘Rosacea’ or ‘Rhinophyma’. The article type was limited to English-language studies dated to 2022-01-01, with no limits on participant age, sex or type. The retrieval strategy of each database was customized according to the usage standard of the database and the scale of the retrieved documents. After the exclusion of repeated articles, a manual review of the citations from these articles was performed to identify additional articles by screening titles, abstracts and manuscripts. The literature screening process is shown in Figure 1, including search strategy and inclusion/exclusion criteria.

2.3. Data extraction and methodology

As for data extraction, the following information for rosacea pathogenesis was extracted by two investigators (XMH and ZXJ) independently: first author’s last name, year of publication, geographical region, study design, sample type, sample size, subtyping of rosacea, cell/bacteria culture/mice used in research, the key conclusion. While these information for risk factors/comorbidity/therapy was added as follow: mean age, gender, number of patient/exposure population-controls, adjusted risk estimate, variables adjusted in the multi-variable analysis, etc. Moreover, publication bias was assessed using the Egger's test and visual inspection of funnel plots (Supplemental Figure 1). These statistical analyses were carried out with the ‘meta’ package of R.

The visualization analysis of the retrieval characteristics of rosacea included the distribution of publication years, countries and regions, organizations, journals, core authors, keywords and key references. Bibliometric analysis and network visualization were performed with VOSviewer (Version 1.6.14; https://www.vosviewer.com/download#download vosviewer) and CiteSpace (Version 6.1. R2; https://sourceforge.net/projects/citespace/files/latest/download). Microsoft Excel 2010 was used to assess the distribution of publication years. The Gunn map (http://lert.co.nz/map/) online world map was used to evaluate the distribution of countries and regions. Ranking was performed using the standard competition ranking method. Microsoft Excel software was utilized for data collection and analysis, and Adobe Illustrator CS6 was used for figure summary as Figures 5, 6, and 7.

3. Results

3.1. Bibliometric analysis

3.1.1. An increased trend line of publications in the field of rosacea

There were 1,980 (74.604%) articles, 350 (13.188%) reviews and 324 (12.208%) letters among the 2,654 publications. The chronological distribution of published documents is shown in Figure 2. The trend line...
demonstrates that the number of documents increased exponentially. The line chart illustrates that the number of documents increased relatively slowly from 1902 (n = 1, 0.038%) to 2002 (n = 33, 1.247%). Overall, the number of publications showed a sharply increasing trend from 2002 (with the largest sequential growth rate, 73%) onward, and the National Rosacea Society Expert Committee has developed a classification system and diagnostic standard to guiding clinicians and researchers. By 2020 (n = 262, 9.902%), the number of publications reached a peak. With a more standardized diagnosis as well as the improvement of aesthetics and quality of life, rosacea has attracted increasing attention worldwide, indicating that it will gradually become a research hotspot.

3.1.2. Rosacea is regarded as a universal and global topic according to its spatial distribution

According to the statistical analysis, 2,654 documents were published by research groups from 86 countries and regions using full counting analysis. The top 10 most prolific countries and regions have been shown in Table 1. The country with the largest number of documents was the United States (n = 927, 34.93%), followed by Turkey (n = 211, 7.95%), China (n = 210, 7.91%), and Germany (n = 205, 8.48%). Besides the number of publications, the United States also ranked the first according to the citation and centrality. The countries and regions with the strongest citation bursts are also shown in Table 1. Among them, China had the highest burst strength of 23.76. The duration of burst began in 2019 and ended in 2022, indicating that there were many researchers studying rosacea in China during 2019–2022. Many of countries have raised attention to rosacea from 1999 and recently more and more countries have also emerged, such as China and France. This spatial distribution maybe closely to the reported a varied prevalence of rosacea in people with skin of color from 1%–22% [4]. Detailly, the research on the racial/ethnic distribution of patients with rosacea has been reported that 3.9% of rosacea patients were Hispanic or Latino, 2.3% were Asian or Pacific Islander, and 2% were black according to the US National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (1993–2010) [12]. And other reasons may also contribute to this phenomenon, such as economy, technologic development, humanities and so on.

3.1.3. The pathogenesis of rosacea has attracted attention according to the citations

Among the total documents (n = 2,654), 40 met the threshold for vitalization analysis. According to the citation analysis of documents (n = 2,581), which reflects the number of times the documents were cited, we listed the top 10 most highly cited documents in Table 2. The range of the number of citations was 218–531. The top highly cited references were Hengge (2006), Wilkin (2002), Solomon (2001a), Yamasaki (2007), Sapadin (2006), Crawford (2004), and Bamford (2004), which had the highest number of citations, indicating that they were the most influential studies associated with rosacea. In addition, a systematic review and updating of international conferences on rosacea were likely cited many times. Half of these studies were related to pathogenetic mechanisms, such as “Pro- and anti-inflammatory forms of interleukin-1 in the tear fluid and conjunctiva of patients with dry eye disease”, which was ranked third and cited 500 times; “Increased serine protease activity and cathelicidin promote skin inflammation in rosacea”, ranked fourth and cited 488 times; and...
Rosacea: I. Etiology, pathogenesis, and subtype classification, ranked sixth and cited 334 times. Notably, the six research articles have focused on the pathogenetic mechanism [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. All of this evidence suggests that pathogenesis plays a vital role in the field of rosacea and has attracted attention for years as a hotspot [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18].

3.1.4. Pathogenesis as a new fast-growing rosacea subject according to the keywords

A total of 6,948 keywords were retrieved from 2,654 documents, and 100 met the threshold. The network visualization map shows the co-occurrence relations of keywords (Figure 3). The size of the circle indicates the occurrence of keywords. As shown in Figure 3, the high-frequency keywords include rosacea, skin, and pathogenesis. The average publication year of these three keywords is from 2012 to 2014. Furthermore, it also shows a fast-growing part that has developed in recent years, as the node in yellow indicates in Figure 3. As can be seen, in the last 5 years, an increasing number of researchers have given attention to cathelicidin, cytokines, immunity, mites, inflammation, pathophysiology, risk, and comorbidity in rosacea, indicating that pathophysiological factors have attracted attention as the focus of future research. Additionally, the management of rosacea, such as therapy, telangiectasia, and pulsed dye laser therapy, is a conspicuous aspect of rosacea research. All of this evidence suggests that it is a hotspot, and many scholars have devoted themselves to researching it.

4. Results of data mining on rosacea

4.1. Each of the core components of pathogenesis tends to increase

An increasing amount of evidence on rosacea etiology suggests that microorganisms (75, 31.9%), immune system (63, 26.8%), abnormal barrier function (33, 14.0%), gene (16, 6.8%), neurogenic (17, 7.2%), and other (30, 12.8%) factors may be genetic components. Additionally, the annual incidence of each factor is shown in Figure 4. The etiologic research on the immune system factors related to rosacea started in 1984, fluctuated rapidly in the last decade, and reached a peak in 2021. Additionally, research on microorganism etiology was conducted earlier, which is a major component (shown in orange in Figure 4) along with immune etiology (shown in blue in Figure 4). “Neurogenic etiology” has been termed earlier but remains slow in progress. Abnormal barrier

![Figure 2. Distribution of publications on rosacea according to year. The number of publications increased slowly from 1902 to 2002. Overall, the number of publications showed an increasing trend in volatility from 2002 onward to a peak in 2020 (primary data for this analysis are shown in Table S7).](image-url)
function and gene parts seem to be emerging aspects of rosacea pathogenesis and have increased in the literature in recent years. Moreover, detailed information on the studies on each component has shown in Table S1-6 and detailly explained in discussion part, the subgroups including (e.g., the roles of *Demodex* and *H. pylori* in microorganisms), study design, key outcomes, and publication year (neurogenetic and genetic etiologies, and immune, microorganism, barrier and other components).

Table 2. List of the top 10 most cited articles in rosacea (2022-01-01).

| Rank by Total Citations | Title                                                                 | Year/type | Corresponding Author | Country | Journal of Publication | Total Citations |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|---------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 1<sup>st</sup>          | Adverse effects of topical glucocorticosteroids                      | 2006 (review) | Hengge UR           | Germany | *J Am Acad Dermatol.*  | 531             |
| 2<sup>nd</sup>          | Standard classification of rosacea: Report of the National Rosacea Society Expert Committee on the Classification and Staging of Rosacea | 2002 (guideline) | Wilkin J             | USA     | *J Am Acad Dermatol.*  | 508             |
| 3<sup>rd</sup>          | Pre- and anti-inflammatory forms of interleukin-1 in the tear fluid and conjunctiva of patients with dry-eye disease | 2001 (article) | Solomon, A           | USA     | *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* | 500             |
| 4<sup>th</sup>          | Increased serine protease activity and cathelicidin promotes skin inflammation in rosacea | 2007 (article) | Yamasaki K           | USA     | *Nat Med.*              | 488             |
| 5<sup>th</sup>          | Tetracyclines: Nonantibiotic properties and their clinical implications | 2006 (review) | Sapadin AN           | USA     | *J Am Acad Dermatol.*  | 456             |
| 6<sup>th</sup>          | Rosacea: I. Etiology, pathogenesis, and subtype classification        | 2004 (review) | Crawford GH          | USA     | *J Am Acad Dermatol.*  | 334             |
| 7<sup>th</sup>          | Standard grading system for Rosacea: Report of the National Rosacea Society Expert Committee on the Classification and Staging of Rosacea | 2004 (guideline) | Wilkin J             | USA     | *J Am Acad Dermatol.*  | 260             |
| 8<sup>th</sup>          | Tetracyclines: a pleitropic family of compounds with promising therapeutic properties. Review of the literature | 2010 (review) | Griffin MO           | USA     | *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol.* | 236             |
| 9<sup>th</sup>          | Azithromycin: mechanisms of action and their relevance for clinical applications | 2014 (review) | Parnham MJ           | Germany | *Pharmacol Ther.*      | 230             |
| 10<sup>th</sup>         | Antimicrobial peptides and the skin immune defense system             | 2008 (review) | Schaufer J           | Germany | *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* | 218             |

* marked the document related to pathogenesis of rosacea. IL-1alpha, Interleukin 1alpha; TLR2, Toll-like receptor 2.

4.2. Risk factors show an interface mechanism in rosacea pathogenesis

We screened out the parts as supporting material for rosacea pathogenesis. The main related risk factors include habits (e.g., facial cleansing, shower, make-up, sun exposure), which suggest an impaired barrier function may be related to rosacea; natural factors (e.g., *H. pylori*, *E. coli*) associated with immunity and microorganisms; genetic factors (e.g., skin type, family history and genetic mutations) associated with genes; and...
neuropsychiatric factors (e.g., stress) associated with neurogenic parts. The detailed study design, individuals and statistical indicators are shown in Table 3.

4.3. Comorbidities and treatment also as vital supporting material for rosacea pathogenesis

Several studies have shown that rosacea is related to systemic disease, which could also contribute to rosacea pathogenesis. The prevailing literature has reported comorbidity associations between rosacea and gastrointestinal disorders (e.g., irritable bowel syndrome (IBS), Crohn’s disease), which proved the association with dysbacteriosis laterally. Notably, psychiatric diagnoses (e.g., anxiety, depression) and neurological disorders (e.g., Parkinson’s disease, migraine, Alzheimer’s disease) suggest a strong association between rosacea and neurogenic pathogenesis. More detailed information (study design, individuals and statistical indicators) is shown in Table 4. Moreover, some of the treatments based on pathogenesis are also regarded as supporting evidence for the etiology of rosacea (Table 5).

5. Discussion

Over the more than one hundred years of rosacea studies, the number of annual publications showed a sharply increasing trend from 2002, with the largest sequential growth rate onward and gradual increase in the last decade, reaching a peak in 2020 and 2021. The turning point in years may refer to emerging technologies (gene sequencing or single-cell sequencing, spatial transcriptomics, and other bioinformatics) and groups. Regardless, the increased curve trend of studies on rosacea suggests that an increasing number of researchers have become interested in rosacea, which indicates that there are still unsolved problems, such as pathogenesis.

Among the research on rosacea, pathogenesis seems to be a key part and a research hotspot. Among the top 10 highly cited documents, more than half of the documents addressed pathology-related studies, such as increased IL-1 expression [13], cathelicidin in skin inflammatory responses [14]. According to the keyword data, an increasing number of researchers have focused on pathogenesis-related items in the last 5 years. Further, we have summarized a systematic mechanistic pathway known to contribute to the pathophysiology of rosacea in Figure 6.

5.1. Genetic factors

The increased evidence in individuals with rosacea suggests that there may be a genetic component of the disorder. Earlier, a family history of rosacea, skin type (Fitzpatrick IV), and specific genetic mutations (ApaI G/T) were reported as risk factors, which strongly suggests a genetic component of the disorder. Various genomic association studies have already identified some genes pointing to various pathogenetic terms, such as the intercellular adhesion molecule-1 (ICAM-1) gene related to barrier function [30], glutathione S-transferase theta 1 (GSTTI) and/or glutathione-S-transferase μ-1 (GSTMI) and nucleotide-binding domain leucine-rich repeat and pyrin domain containing receptor 3 (NLRP3) gene related to immune and inflammation [31, 32, 33], human leukocyte antigen-DR alpha (HLA-DRA), butyrophilin-like 2 (BTN2L2) and signal transducer of activators of transcription (STAT) gene related to the immune [8, 34, 35]. Studies based on family, twin and regional factors (Celtic and Northern European descent) also suggest a genetic component of rosacea [29, 36]. Moreover, genetic studies have been reported every year since 2015 and may continue to increase with emerging technologies (e.g., gene sequencing [37], omics analysis [38], other bioinformatics tools utilized in rosacea [39]). Further investigation will continue to focus on the mechanistic link between the gene variants identified in the rosacea phenotype [40]. Additionally, gene–gene (e.g., lncRNA-mRNA coexpression networks [41]) and gene–environment interactions (e.g., gene-ultraviolet) would be one of the focuses of intensive research studies. Finally, more research needs to be...
Table 3. Risk factors as supporting evidence for rosacea pathogenesis.

| Related factors | Differentiation | P/N | Design | Rosacea/Reference | No. of rosacea (F/M) | No. of reference (F/M) | Events in rosacea | Events in reference | Statistical indicators | Statistic | Adjusted P Value | Ref. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----|--------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|-----------------|------|
| Gene            |                 |     |        |                   |                     |                       |                   |                   |                      |          |                 |      |
| Family history  | rosacea         | P   | CC     | 122/132           | \                   | \                     | \                 | \                 | OR (95% CI)          | 4.31     | (2.34–7.92)     | <0.0001 Bream et al., 2010 |
| Family history  | nasal lesions   | P   | CC     | 87/688            | 86 (70/16)          | 688 (587/101)        | 11 (12.8%)        | 50 (7.3%)         | OR (95% CI)          | 2.12     | (1.01–4.46)     | 0.049 Wu et al., 2021 |
| Family history  | rhinophyma      | P   | CC     | 52/156            | 2/50                | 3/153                | 25 (46%)          | 2 (1.3%)          | OR (95% CI)          | 160.7    | (27.3–944.6)    | <0.001 Second et al., 2019 |
| Family history  | rosacea         | P   | CC     | 1195/621          | 914/281             | 461/160              | 293 (24.5%)       | 40 (6.4%)         | OR (95% CI)          | 4.718    | (3.537–6.672)   | 0.000 Aksoy et al., 2019 |
| Gene            |                 |     |        |                   |                     |                       |                   |                   |                      |          |                 |      |
| GSTM1 (−/−)     | rosacea         | P   | CC     | 45/100            | 31/14               | 53/47                | 29 (64.4%)        | 39 (39%)          | OR (95% CI)          | 2.84     | (1.37–5.89)     | 0.005 Yazici et al., 2006 |
| GandT1 (−/−)    | rosacea         | P   | CC     | 45/100            | 31/14               | 53/47                | 20 (44.4%)        | 23 (23%)          | OR (95% CI)          | 2.68     | (1.27–5.67)     | 0.009 Yazici et al., 2006 |
| TaqI alleles    | Mutant          | P   | DS     | 60/0              | 46/14               | 46/14                | 10 (17%)          | 22 (37%)          | OR (95% CI)          | 0.23     | (0.07–0.74)     | 0.01 Akdogan et al., 2019 |
| Apal alleles    | WT              | P   | DS     | 60/0              | 46/14               | 46/14                | 12 (20%)          | 24 (40%)          | OR (95% CI)          | 0.29     | (0.10–0.84)     | <0.01 Akdogan et al., 2019 |
| Apal G/T       | Heterozygous    | P   | DS     | 60/0              | 46/14               | 46/14                | 43 (26%)          | 28 (17%)          | OR (95% CI)          | 5.26     | (1.51–18.35)    | <0.01 Akdogan et al., 2019 |
| Cdx2 alleles    | Heterozygous    | P   | DS     | 60/0              | 46/14               | 46/14                | 22 (37%)          | 15 (25%)          | OR (95% CI)          | 2.51     | (1.03–6.12)     | 0.04 Akdogan et al., 2019 |
| Neurogenic      |                 |     |        |                   |                     |                       |                   |                   |                      |          |                 |      |
| Emotional change| rosacea         | P   | DS     | 168/0            | 117/51              | \                    | 12 (7.1%)         | \                 | \                    | \        | \               | Bae et al., 2009 |
| Nervousness and anxiety | rosacea | N   | DS     | 40/0              | \                   | \                    | 25 (62.5%)        | \                 | \                    | \        | \               | WATSON et al., 1965 |
| Stress          | rosacea         | P   | CR     | 14/0              | 12/2                | \                    | 10 (71%)          | \                 | \                    | \        | Scharschmidt et al., 2011 |
| Stress          | rosacea         | P   | DS     | 254/0             | 254 rosacea         | \                    | 188 (74.02%)      | \                 | \                    | \        | Chang et al., 2021 |
| Rest and relaxation | rosacea | N   | DS     | 168/0            | 117/51              | \                    | 18 (10.7)         | \                 | \                    | \        | Bae et al., 2009 |
| Exercise        | rosacea         | P   | CR     | 14/0              | 12/2                | \                    | 9 (64%)           | \                 | \                    | \        | Scharschmidt et al., 2011 |
| Exercise/hot bath | rosacea | P   | DS     | 168/0            | 117/51              | \                    | 41 (24.4%)        | \                 | \                    | \        | Bae et al., 2009 |
| Sleep quality   | rosacea         | P   | CSS    | 608/608          | 608 (526/82)        | 608 (526/82)        | Measured by PSQI  | PSQI              | OR (96% CI)          | 3.525    | (2.759–4.519)   | no Wang et al., 2020 |
| Sleep quality   | rosacea         | P   | CSS    | 608/608          | 608 (526/82)        | 608 (526/82)        | Measured by PSQI  | PSQI              | OR (97% CI)          | 1.847    | (1.512–2.570)   | no Wang et al., 2020 |
| Spicy food      | rosacea         | P   | DS     | 254/0             | 254 rosacea         | \                    | 153 (60.23%)      | \                 | \                    | \        | Chang et al., 2021 |
| Spicy food (≥7 times per week) | rosacea | P   | CC     | 1347/1290        | 1178/169            | 1096/194            | 572 (42.5%)       | 190 (14.7%)       | OR (95% CI)          | 1.38     | (0.87–2.18)     | Yuan et al., 2019 |
| Spicy food or hot food | rosacea | P   | DS     | 168/0            | 117/51              | \                    | 4 (2.4%)          | \                 | \                    | \        | Bae et al., 2009 |
| Temperature change | rosacea | P   | DS     | 254              | 254 rosacea         | \                    | 222 (87.4%)       | \                 | \                    | \        | Chang et al., 2021 |
| Cool            | rosacea         | N   | DS     | 168/0            | 117/51              | \                    | 18 (10.7)         | \                 | \                    | \        | Bae et al., 2009 |
| Heat            | rosacea         | P   | CR     | 14/0              | 12/2                | \                    | 13 (93%)          | \                 | \                    | \        | Scharschmidt et al., 2011 |
| Heat or sun     | rosacea         | P   | DS     | 108/0            | 53/55               | \                    | 34 (31.5%)        | \                 | \                    | \        | Sibenge et al., 1992 |
| Hot drinks      | rosacea         | N   | DS     | 40/0              | \                   | \                    | 2 (5%)            | \                 | \                    | \        | WATSON et al., 1965 |
| Hot showers     | rosacea         | P   | CR     | 14/0              | 12/2                | \                    | 11 (79%)          | \                 | \                    | \        | Bae et al., 2009 |
| Season changes  | rosacea         | P   | DS     | 254              | 254 rosacea         | \                    | 144 (56.69%)      | \                 | \                    | \        | Chang et al., 2021 |
| Thermal stimuli | rosacea         | P   | DS     | 224/0            | M/F – 0.4           | \                    | 25%               | \                 | \                    | \        | Khaled et al., 2010 |
| Warm environment| rosacea         | P   | DS     | 168/0            | 117/51              | \                    | 14 (8.3%)         | \                 | \                    | \        | Bae et al., 2009 |

(continued on next page)
| Related factors | Differentiation | P/N | Design | Rosacea/Reference | No. of rosacea (F/M) | Events in rosacea | Events in reference | Statistical indicators | Statistic | Adjusted P Value | Ref. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----|--------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------------|------|
| Warmth          | rosacea         | P   | DS     | 40/0              | \                    | 2 (5%)            | \                 | \                    | \         | \               | \    |
| GCS             |                 | P   | DS     | 108/0             | 53/55                | 32 (29.6%)        | \                 | \                    | \         | \               | Sibenge et al., 1992 |
| GCS, Fluorinated GCS | rosacea        | P   | CR     | 14/0              | 9/5                  | 14 (100%)         | \                 | \                    | \         | \               | Sneddon et al., 1969 |
| Sun exposure    | Using sunscreen cream (≥6/week) | rosacea | P | CC | 1245/1538 | 1245 (1124/121) | 1538 (1388/150) | 173 (13.9%) | 327 (21.3%) | OR (95% CI) | 0.303 (0.209–0.44) | <0.001 |
| Sun exposure    | Using sunscreen cream (1–2/week) | rosacea | N | CC | 1245/1538 | 1245 (1124/121) | 1538 (1388/150) | 125 (10.0%) | 247 (16.1%) | OR (95% CI) | 0.507 (0.35-0.727) | <0.001 |
| Sun exposure    | Using sunscreen cream (3–5/week) | rosacea | N | CC | 1245/1538 | 1245 (1124/121) | 1538 (1388/150) | 67 (5.4%) | 116 (7.5%) | OR (95% CI) | 0.523 (0.328–0.867) | 0.017 |
| Sun exposure    |                 | P   | DS     | 168/0             | 117/51               | 42 (25.0%)        | \                 | \                    | \         | \               | Bae et al., 2009 |
| Sun exposure    |                 | N   | DS     | 168/0             | 117/51               | 1 (0.6)           | \                 | \                    | \         | \               | Bae et al., 2009 |
| Sun exposure    |                 | P   | DS     | 224/0             | M/F – 0.4           | 64%               | \                 | \                    | \         | \               | Khaled et al., 2010 |
| Sun exposure    |                 | P   | DS     | 254/0             | 254 rosacea         | 231 (90.4%)       | \                 | \                    | \         | \               | Chang et al., 2021 |
| Sun-based job   | rosacea severity | P | DS | \ | \ | \ | \ | \ | t ratio | -1.70 | 0.04 | Alinia et al., 2018 |
| Sunlight        | rosacea         | P   | DS     | 40/0              | \                    | 3 (7.5%)          | \                 | \                    | \         | \               | WATSON et al., 1965 |
| Sunlight        | rosacea         | P   | CR     | 14/0              | 12/2                 | 13 (93%)          | \                 | \                    | \         | \               | Scharschmidt et al., 2011 |

Risk factors will include in P < 0.01. GSTM1, Glutathione-S-transferase μ-1; GSTT1, Glutathione S-transferase theta 1; WT, Wild type; GCS, Glucocorticoids; P/N, positive/negative; DS, Description study; CC, Case control; CSS, Cross-sectional study; CR, Case report; F/M, Female/Male; PSQI, Pittsburgh sleep quality index; OR, Odds ratio; CI, Confidence intervals.
Table 4. Comorbidities as supporting evidence for rosacea pathogenesis.

| Comorbidity                        | P/N       | Design | No. of rosacea (F/M) | Age (rosacea/control) | Events in rosacea patients | Events in control | Statistical indicators | Statistic | P Value | Ref.                  |
|------------------------------------|-----------|--------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|
| **Autoimmune disease**             |           |        |                      |                       |                           |                    |                       |           |          |                       |
| Ankylosing spondylitis             | P CSS     | 12936  | (8540/4396)          | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 72 (0.56%)                | 21 (0.16%)          | OR (95% CI)           | 2.34      | 0.001    | Woo et al., 2020       |
| Autoimmune thyroiditis             | P CSS     | 12936  | (8540/4396)          | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 121 (0.94%)               | 49 (0.38%)          | OR (95% CI)           | 1.96      | <0.001  | Woo et al., 2020       |
| Multiple sclerosis                 | P CC      | 6759   | (4270/2489)          | 40.2/40.2              | 49 (0.7%)                 | 149 (0.4%)         | OR (95% CI)           | 1.65      | 0.003    | Hua et al., 2015       |
| Rheumatoid arthritis               | P CSS     | 12936  | (8540/4396)          | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 596 (4.6%)                | 272 (2.1%)         | OR (95% CI)           | 1.72      | <0.001  | Woo et al., 2020       |
| Rheumatoid arthritis               | P CC      | 6759   | (4270/2489)          | 40.2/40.2              | 217 (3.2%)                | 522 (1.5%)         | OR (95% CI)           | 2.14      | <0.001  | Hua et al., 2015       |
| Rheumatoid arthritis               | P CC      | 25     | (14/11)              | 48/48                 | 1 (4%)                    | 0 \                | \                     | \         | \        | \                     |
| Sjogren syndrome                   | P CSS     | 12936  | (8540/4396)          | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 94 (0.73%)                | 37 (0.29%)         | OR (95% CI)           | 2.05      | <0.001  | Woo et al., 2020       |
| Systemic sclerosis                 | P CSS     | 12936  | (8540/4396)          | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 17 (1.13%)                | 2 (0.02%)          | OR (95% CI)           | 6.57      | 0.012    | Woo et al., 2020       |
| Allergic conjunctivitis            | P CSS     | 12936  | (8540/4396)          | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 259 (2.0%)                | 121 (0.94%)        | OR (95% CI)           | 1.57      | <0.001  | Woo et al., 2020       |
| Allergic rhinitis                  | P CSS     | 12936  | (8540/4396)          | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 2064 (16.0%)              | 938 (7.3%)         | OR (95% CI)           | 1.65      | <0.001  | Woo et al., 2020       |
| **Neurologic**                     |           |        |                      |                       |                           |                    |                       |           |          |                       |
| Alzheimer disease                  | P CC      | 82439  | (55161/27278)        | 42.1/40.4              | 465 (0.56%)               | 28728 (0.52%)      | HR (95% CI)           | 1.25      | <0.001  | Egeberg et al., 2016   |
| Fibromyalgia syndrome (FMS)        | P CSS     | 100    | (100/0)              | 43.2/41.2              | 37 (37%)                  | 21 (21%)           | \                     | 0.37      | <0.01   | Arac et al., 2021      |
| Glioma                             | P CS      | 68372  | (45994/22378)        | 42.2/40.8              | 184 (0.27%)               | 20934 (0.39%)      | IR (95% CI)           | 1.36      | <0.001  | Egeberg et al., 2016   |
| Migraine                           | N CSS     | 12936  | (8540/4396)          | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 54 (0.42%)                | 58 (0.45%)         | OR (95% CI)           | 0.66      | 0.053    | Woo et al., 2020       |
| Migraine                           | P CS      | 49475  | (33659/15816)        | 53.7/48.6              | 1995 (2.21%)              | 41606 (0.96%)      | HR (95% CI)           | 1.23      | <0.001  | Egeberg et al., 2017   |
| Migraine                           | P CSS     | 53927  | (33879/20048)        | \                     | 4803 (8.9%)               | 4137 (7.7%)        | OR (95% CI)           | 1.18      | 0.13  \ | Sprodlin et al., 2013  |
| Parkinson disease                  | P CC      | 157    | (89/48)              | 46/42                  | 66 (44%)                  | 21 (13%)           | \                     | <0.0005  | \        | Tan et al., 1976       |
| Parkinson's disease                | P CSS     | 68053  | (45712/22341)        | 42.2/40.8              | 280 (0.41%)               | 22107 (0.41%)      | IR (95% CI)           | 1.71      | 0.02  | Egeberg et al., 2016   |
| Cardiovascular disease             | P CSS     | 14696  | (10278/4417/1)       | 399383 (246777/152542/64) | 49 (0.33%)                | 985 (0.25%)        | OR (95% CI)           | 1.39      | 0.02    | Mathieu et al., 2018   |
| **Gastrointestinal disorders**     |           |        |                      |                       |                           |                    |                       |           |          |                       |
| Barrett's oesophagus               | P CC      | 3485   | (2384/1101)          | 13940 (9536/4404)      | 59.6/59.4                 | 88 (2.5%)          | OR (95% CI)           | 1.69      | <0.01   | Yi et al., 2021        |
| Barrett's oesophagus               | P CC      | 3485/13942 | \                | 88 (2.5%)               | 223 (1.6%)                | \                     | \                     | \         | <0.001  | Yi et al., 2021        |
| Celiac disease                     | P CC      | 49475  | (33659/15816)        | 3432213 (212826/2129951) | 53.7/48.6               | 52 (0.11%)         | 2643 (0.06%)         | 1.46      | 0.007   | Egeberg et al., 2017   |
| Celiac disease                     | P CC      | 6759   | (4270/2489)          | 40.2/40.2              | 32 (0.5%)                 | 80 (0.2%)          | OR (95% CI)           | 2.03      | <0.001  | Hua et al., 2015       |
| Crohn's disease                    | P CC      | 1127   | (1127/0)             | 95187 (95187/0)        | 37.6/36.2                | 11 (0.98%)         | OR (95% CI)           | 2.20      | 0.15  | Li et al., 2016        |
| Comorbidity                  | P/N  | Design | No. of rosacea (F/M) | No. of control (F/M) | Age (rosacea/ control) | Events in rosacea (F/M) | Events in control | Statistical indicators | Statistic | P Value | Ref.                  |
|-----------------------------|------|--------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------|-----------------------|
| Crohn's disease            | P CC | 80957  | 80957 (Not specified) | 326 (0.4%)           | 226 (0.3%)             | OR (95% CI)             | 1.49 (1.25–1.77) |                      |           |         | Spoendlin et al., 2016 |
| Crohn's disease            | P CC | 3485/13,947 |                   | 92 (2.6%)            | 291 (2.1%)             | HR (95% CI)             | 1.45 (1.19–1.77) | <0.001                 |           |         | Yi et al., 2021       |
| Crohn's disease            | P CS | 49475  | 4312213 (2182262/ 2129951) | 53.7/48.6           | 5684 (0.13%)          | OR (95% CI)             | 1.45 (1.19–1.77) | <0.001                 |           |         | Eggeberg et al., 2017 |
| Diverticulitis             | P CC | 3485/13,948 |                   | 713 (20.5%)          | 2465 (17.7%)           | OR (95% CI)             | 1.16 (1.05–1.28) | <0.01                  |           |         | Yi et al., 2021       |
| Diverticulitis             | P CC | 3485 (2284/ 1101) | 13940 (9536/4404) | 59.6/59.4            | 713 (20.5%)           | 2465 (17.7%)           | OR (95% CI)       | 1.16 (1.05–1.28) | <0.01                  |         |
| Dyspepsia                  | P CC | 60 (31/29) |                   | 45.7/0               | 34                     |                        |                    | <0.001                 |           |         | Yi et al., 2021       |
| Gastritis                  | P CC | 3485/13,943 |                   | 446 (12.8%)          | 1366 (9.8%)            |                        |                    | <0.001                 |           |         | Yi et al., 2021       |
| GERD                       | P CC | 3485 (2284/ 1101) | 13940 (9536/4404) | 59.6/59.4            | 1275 (36.6%)           | 4261 (30.6%)           | OR (95% CI)       | 1.27 (1.17–1.38) | <0.001                 |         |
| GERD                       | P CC | 3485/13,941 |                   | 1275 (36.6%)         | 4261 (30.6%)           |                        |                    | <0.001                 |           |         | Yi et al., 2021       |
| GERD                       | P CS | 12936 (8540/ 4396) | 12936 (8540/4396) | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 3118 (24%)      | 2487 (19%)           | OR (95% CI)       | 1.05 (0.91–1.19) | 0.052                  |         |
| GERD                       | P CS | 1195 (914/281) | 621 (461/160)     | 44.6 ± 13.8/42.5 ± 13.4 | 158 (13.2%) | 61 (9.8%)           | OR (95% CI)       | 1.399 (1.023–1.912) | 0.036                  |         |
| Hepatobiliary system disorders | P CSS | 1195 (914/281) | 621 (461/160)     | 44.6 ± 13.8/42.5 ± 13.4 | 12 (1.0%)     | 1 (0.2%)           | OR (95% CI)       | 6.289 (1.010–48.479) | 0.048                  |         |
| Inflammatory bowel disease | P CS | 89356 (68051/ 21305) | 178712 (136102/ 42610) | 32.58/32.58 | 16 (0.018%) | 37 (0.020%) | HR (95% CI) | 1.94 (1.04–3.63) | 0.04                  |         |
| Irritable bowel syndrome   | P CC | 3485 (2284/ 1101) | 13940 (9536/4404) | 59.6/59.4            | 333 (9.6%)            | 1032 (7.4%)           | OR (95% CI)       | 1.62 (1.02–2.58) | <0.05                  |         |
| Irritable bowel syndrome   | P CSS | 12936 (8540/ 4396) | 12936 (8540/4396) | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 147 (11.2%) | 1226 (9.5%) | OR (95% CI) | 1.18 (0.62–1.42) | <0.001                 |         |
| Irritable bowel syndrome   | P CC | 49475 (33659/ 15816) | 4312213 (2182262/ 2129951) | 53.7/48.6 | 291 (0.59%) | 17047 (0.40%) | HR (95% CI) | 1.34 (1.19–1.50) | <0.001                 |         |
| Irritable bowel syndrome   | P CC | 3485/13,946 |                   | 333 (9.6%)          | 1032 (7.4%)            | HR (95% CI)             | 1.34 (1.19–1.50) | <0.001                 |         |
| Non-diabetic gastroparesis | P CSS | 3485/13,944 |                   | 42 (1.2%)           | 107 (0.8%)            | OR (95% CI)             | 1.49 (1.03–2.14) | <0.05                  |         |
| Non-diabetic gastroparesis | P CC | 3485 (2284/ 1101) | 13940 (9536/4404) | 59.6/59.4            | 42 (1.2%)            | 107 (0.8%)            | OR (95% CI)       | 1.49 (1.03–2.14) | <0.05                  |         |
| Oesophagitis               | P CC | 3485 (2284/ 1101) | 13940 (9536/4404) | 59.6/59.4            | 323 (9.3%)            | 920 (6.6%)           | OR (95% CI)       | 1.30 (1.07–1.57) | <0.01                  |         |
| Peptic ulcer               | P CSS | 61 (0/61) | 193 (0/193)        | 42.8/0/not mentioned | 8 (13.1%)         | 2 (1.0%)            | OR (95% CI) | !                     | 0.021                  |         |
| SIBO                       | P CC | 3485 (2284/ 1101) | 13940 (9536/4404) | 59.6/59.4            | 26 (0.7%)          | 63 (0.5%)           | OR (95% CI)       | 1.29 (1.13–1.47) | <0.001                 |         |
| SIBO                       | P CC | 113 (82/31) | 60 (40/20)         | 52 (46%)            | 52 (46%)          | 3 (5%)             | OR (95% CI) | !                     | <0.001                  |         |
| Ulcerative colitis         | P CC | 3485/13,945 |                   | 42 (0.7%)          | 63 (0.5%)            | OR (95% CI)             | 1.02 (1.02–1.39) | 0.028                  |         |
| Ulcerative colitis         | P CC | 3485 (2284/ 1101) | 13940 (9536/4404) | 59.6/59.4            | 556 (0.7%)         | 322 (0.4%)           | OR (95% CI)       | 1.65 (1.43–1.90) | <0.05                  |         |
| Psychiatric diagnoses      |       |        |        |                      |        |        |                      |        |                      |        |         | Spoendlin et al., 2016 |
| Adjustment disorder        | P CC | 3485 (2284/ 1101) | 13940 (9536/4404) | 59.6/59.4            | 179 (5.1%)          | 431 (3.1%)           | OR (95% CI)       | 1.22 (1.03–1.47) | <0.05                  |         |

(continued on next page)
| Comorbidity | Design | No. of rosacea (F/M) | No. of control (F/M) | Age (rosacea/ control) | Events in rosacea patients | Events in control | Statistical indicators | Statistic | P Value | Ref. |
|-------------|--------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------|------|
| Anxiety     | P CSS  | 774 (669/75)         | \                     | \                      | 417 (53.9%)                 | \                      | Prevalence (95% CI)  | 53.9%     | 0.001   | Chen et al., 2021 |
| Anxiety     | P CS   | 7881 (5336/2545)     | 31524 (21344/10180)  | 40.60 ± 15.37/40.89 ± 15.30 | 844 (10.71%) | 3031 (9.61%) | HR (95% CI) | 2.911     | <0.001  | Hung et al., 2019 |
| Anxiety (Anxiety score ≥ 9) | P CC | 201 (137/64) | 196 (119/77) | 38.8 ± 13.7/38.2 ± 14.1 | 41 (20.40%) | 23 (11.70%) | Morbidity | 0.204 | \ | Wu et al., 2018 |
| Anxiety disorder | P CC | 194 (147/47) | 194 (147/47) | 47 (40-56)/46 (39-54.25) | 21 (10.8%) | 5 (2.6%) | OR (95% CI) | 4.59 | 0.003 | Incel et al., 2019 |
| Anxiety disorder | P CSS | 12936 (8540/4396) | 12936 (8540/4396) | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 757 (5.9%) | 582 (4.5%) | OR (95% CI) | 1.03 | <0.001 | Wu et al., 2020 |
| Anxiety disorders | P CC | 55439 (36672/18677) | 4576904 (2183601/2393303) | 39.9/37.7 | 7413 (13.4%) | 946025 (20.7%) | IRR (95% CI) | 1.89 | (1.72-2.07) | <0.001 | Egeberg et al., 2016 |
| Anxiety, generalized anxiety disorder | P CC | 3485 (2384/1101) | 13940 (9536/4404) | 59.6/59.4 | 415 (11.9%) | 1051 (7.5%) | OR (95% CI) | 1.25 | (1.10-1.42) | <0.001 | Yi et al., 2021 |
| Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder | P CS | 7881 (5336/2545) | 31524 (21344/10180) | 40.60 ± 15.37/40.89 ± 15.30 | 1 (0.01%) | 10 (0.03%) | HR (95% CI) | 1.045 | (1.003-1.089) | 0.042 | Hung et al., 2019 |
| Bipolar disorder | P CS | 7881 (5336/2545) | 31524 (21344/10180) | 40.60 ± 15.37/40.89 ± 15.30 | 22 (0.28%) | 72 (0.23%) | HR (95% CI) | 3.194 | (3.066-3.329) | <0.001 | Hung et al., 2019 |
| Dementia | N CSS | 12936 (8540/4396) | 12936 (8540/4396) | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 168 (1.2%) | 197 (1.5%) | OR (95% CI) | 0.80 | (0.65-0.97) | 0.051 | Woo et al., 2020 |
| Depression | P CSS | 774 (669/75) | \ | \ | 450 (58.1%) | \ | Prevalence (95% CI) | 58.1% | (54.7-61.6%) | Chen et al., 2021 |
| Depression | P CC | 194 (147/47) | 194 (147/47) | 47 (40-56)/46 (39-54.25) | 27 (12.9%) | 9 (4.1%) | OR (95% CI) | 3.041 | (1.38-6.07) | 0.006 | Incel et al., 2019 |
| Depression | P CSS | 12936 (8540/4396) | 12936 (8540/4396) | 47.4 ± 0.13/48.4 ± 0.13 | 890 (6.9%) | 691 (5.34%) | OR (95% CI) | 1.03 | (0.93-1.12) | <0.001 | Woo et al., 2020 |
| Depression | P CS | 55439 (36672/18677) | 4576904 (2183601/2393303) | 39.9/37.7 | 5527 (10.0%) | 672096 (14.7%) | IRR (95% CI) | 1.96 | (1.82-2.12) | <0.001 | Egeberg et al., 2016 |
| Depression symptoms | P CC | 53927 (33879/20048) | 53927 (33879/20048) | \ | 8883 (16.5%) | 7907 (14.7%) | OR (95% CI) | 1.20 | (1.16-1.24) | \ | Sjoedtlin et al., 2014 |
| Depression | P CC | 201 (137/64) | 196 (119/77) | 38.8 ± 13.7/38.2 ± 14.1 | 33 (16.40%) | 16 (8.20%) | Morbidity | 0.164 | | Wu et al., 2018 |
| Depression symptoms | P CC | 120 (107/13) | 497 (369/128) | 42.3/40.3 | 36 (30%) | 34 (6.8%) | OR (95% CI) | 7.22 | (4.12-12.63) | <0.001 | Lukaviciute et al., 2020 |
| Depression, MDD | P CC | 3485 (2384/1101) | 13940 (9536/4404) | 59.6/59.4 | 219 (6.3%) | 724 (5.2%) | OR (95% CI) | 1.31 | (1.14-1.51) | <0.001 | Yi et al., 2021 |
| Depression | P CC | 13026 (9884/3142) | \ | \ | \ | \ | Prevalence (95% CI) | 20.0 | (19.3-20.7) | \ | Lin et al., 2013 |
| Depression, MDD | P CS | 7881 (5336/2545) | 31524 (21344/10180) | 40.60 ± 15.37/40.89 ± 15.30 | 360 (4.57%) | 995 (3.16%) | HR (95% CI) | 3.783 | (3.630-3.941) | <0.001 | Hung et al., 2019 |
| Manic disorder | P CS | 7881 (5336/2545) | 31524 (21344/10180) | 40.60 ± 15.37/40.89 ± 15.30 | 1981 (25.14 %) | 7873 (24.97%) | HR (95% CI) | 2.631 | (2.525-2.741) | <0.001 | Hung et al., 2019 |
| Obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) | P CS | 7881 (5336/2545) | 31524 (21344/10180) | 40.60 ± 15.37/40.89 ± 15.30 | 11 (0.14%) | 18 (0.06%) | OR (95% CI) | 6.389 | (6.132-6.657) | <0.001 | Hung et al., 2019 |
| Persistent mood disorders | P CC | 3485 (2384/1101) | 13940 (9536/4404) | 59.6/59.4 | 37 (1.1%) | 73 (0.5%) | OR (95% CI) | 1.59 | (1.06-2.37) | <0.05 | Yi et al., 2021 |
| Personality disorder | P CS | 7881 (5336/2545) | 31524 (21344/10180) | 40.60 ± 15.37/40.89 ± 15.30 | 6 (0.08%) | 22 (0.07%) | HR (95% CI) | 2.851 | (2.737-2.971) | <0.001 | Hung et al., 2019 |
conduct on the causative genes, including their detailed functional feedback, for clinical applications.

5.2. Microorganisms

The percentages of studies related to microorganisms is extraordinarily large in the area of rosacea pathogenesis. According to our data, microbial pathogenesis can be divided into two parts: 1. Infection: Demodex/mite and H. pylori infection; 2. Dysbacteriosis: microorganisms in the skin, blood and gut.

The earlier study focused on descriptive research, has reported mite was only a highlighted risks [42]. Multiple studies have focused on the strong association of Demodex in deep pathogenesis, such as inflammatory stimulation [43, 44], tissue degradation [45], targeted therapies [46]. Detailly, the mechanism may be related to Demodex-associated Bacillus proteins, which could involve in inositol 1,4,5-trisphosphate (IP3) pathway [21], leading to corneal scarring [47] or erythema [48]. However, the topic regarding the causality between Demodex/mite and rosacea is still controversial. Immune and skin barrier dysregulation in rosacea patients may also lead to pathological growth of Demodex/mite [49]. So, more recent studies have reported Demodex/mite as aggravated factors of rosacea [50]. Overall, causality needs to be further studied through close observation of rosacea patients through the entire development combined with basic studies and accurate testing methods.

The role of H. pylori in the rosacea's pathogenesis remains controversial, which is mostly reported as an aggravating factor in rosacea and the target therapy is beneficial [51]. Other dysbacteriosis or targeted therapies have also attracted attention as they relate to skin microorganisms (S epidermidis [52]) and intestinal flora (E. coli Nissle therapy [53]). However, some studies have conducted superficial difference analyses. Therefore, how to explain a deeper microorganism mechanism contributing to the progression of rosacea and how to address it remain challenges. Whether inner linkage is involved in systematic dysbacteriosis occurring in the blood, gut, and skin as axis also requires further investigation to guide systematic and maintenance treatment on rosacea and reduce recurrence [54].

5.3. Immune system dysregulation

Research on the immunology related to the rosacea pathogenesis has rapidly increased in recent years. In addition to the technologies, research models have been established to aid this effort (IL-37 induced rosacea-like traits in mice and various cells) [55]. IL-37 (Cathelicidin antimicrobial peptide) and kallikrein 5 (KLK5) may serve as the key contributors to the proinflammatory and proangiogenic effects, which are highly expressed in the skin of patients with rosacea. Recent studies may pay more attention to the integrated mechanism of their up/downstream molecules (e.g., NLRP3 inflammasome [56], IL-36γ [57], protease-activated receptor 2 (PAR-2) [58], mechanistic target of rapamycin complex 1 (mTORC1) [59]). Additionally, it has also reported high expression of toll-like receptor (TLR) family and antimicrobial peptide) and kallikrein 5 (KLK5) may serve as the key contributors to the proinflammatory and proangiogenic effects, which are highly expressed in the skin of patients with rosacea.

Recent work has also focused on immune cells. An increased baseline number, activation and polarization of immune cells have been found in patients with rosacea (e.g., mast cells, dendritic cells, T cells, Langerhans cells, plasma cells, macrophages, neutrophils) [62]. For example, N2-polarized neutrophils reduce inflammation in rosacea by regulating vascular factors and proliferation of CD4+ cells [63]. A continued increasing trend may focus on more detailed and causative mechanisms, and a more complex co-network. Notably, these molecules have also contributed to diagnosis and treatment (e.g., doxycycline inhibited MMP [64], azelaic acid (AxA) inhibited KLK5 and TLR2 [65]). Thus, the
### Table 5. Treatment as supporting evidence for rosacea pathogenesis.

| Subtitle | Treatment | Design | Differentiation | Human sample | Cell/ mice | Mechanism | Ref. |
|----------|-----------|--------|-----------------|--------------|------------|-----------|------|
| **Immune** | | | | | | | |
| KLK 5, MMP-3 | Oral doxycycline | RA | Rosacea | \ | \ | An inhibited activation of trypptic KLKs by inhibiting of matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs) in keratinocytes. | Kanada et al., 2012 |
| KLK5 | Gold nanoparticles (GNP) | RA | Rosacea | \ | Cell | KLLK5 inhibited intracellular KLK5 activity in HaCaT cells and diminished secretion of IL-8 under inflammatory conditions triggered by TLR-2 ligands. | Limón et al., 2018 |
| KLK5 | Oral rifampicinoids, from natural sources | RA | Dermatoses (rosacea, etc.) | \ | Cell + | An inhibition of KLK5 protease activity and cathelicidin peptide production. | Matsubara et al., 2017 |
| KLK5, MMP-9, VEGF | Compounds | RA | Rosacea | \ | Cell | Dextran could inhibit KLK5 and MMP-9 mRNA expression, and IL-8, IL-1α and VEGF production. | Hernandez et al., 2018 |
| LL-37 | Chlamydial Plasmid-Encoded Virulence Factor Pgp3 | RA | Rosacea | \ | Cell | The middle region of Pgp3 (Pgp3m) was responsible for both the binding to and neutralization of LL-37. | Hou et al., 2016 |
| LL-37 | Cinnamtannin B1 (CB1) | RA | Rosacea | \ | Mice | CB1 attenuated LL-37-induced inflammation, specifically IL-8 production, through inhibiting the phosphorylation of ERK. | Kan et al., 2020 |
| LL-37 | Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) | RA | Rosacea | \ | Mice + cell | HQQ attenuated LL37-mediated MCs activation partly via inhibiting KCa3.1-mediated calcium signaling. | Li et al., 2020 |
| LL-37 | Oral artesunate, doxycycline | RA | Rosacea | \ | \ | A decrease of inflammatory response | Li et al., 2018 |
| LL-37 | RNA Aptamer Apt 21-2 | RA | Rosacea | \ | Cell | Prevalence of LL-37 in these inflammatory skin conditions, as an anti-IL-17A RNA aptamer, Apt 21-2. | MacLeod et al., 2019 |
| LL-37 | Single-stranded oligonucleotide (ssON) | RA | Rosacea | \ | Mice + cell | Its ability to inhibit the basic secretagogues compound 48/80 (C48/80)-and LL-37 in vitro and in vivo. | Dondalska et al., 2020 |
| LL-37 | Topical AzA 15% Gel | RCT | Rosacea | 20 PPR | \ | Azelaic acid has been found to inhibit the pathologic expression of cathelicidin, as well as the hyperactive protease activity that cleaves cathelicidin into LL-37. | Wirth et al., 2017 |
| LL-37 | Topical SAGEs | RA | Rosacea | \ | Mice + cell | A decrease of erythema and PMN infiltration from intradermal LL-37. | Zhang et al., 2011 |
| LL-37, KLK5 | Citron Essential Oils | RA | Rosacea | \ | Cell | KLK5 and LL-37 induced by VD3 were suppressed by citron seed and unripe citron essential oils | Jeon et al., 2018 |
| LL-37, KLK5 | Superoxide dismutase 3 (SOD3) | RA | Rosacea | \ | Mice + cell | SOD3 on LL-37- or KLK-5-induced skin inflammation in vitro and in vivo and its underlying anti-inflammatory mechanisms. | Agrahari et al., 2020 |
| LL-37, KLK5, PAR2, VEGF | Topical Dermasence Refining Gel (DRG) | RA | Rosacea | \ | Cell | The protein expression of all four inflammatory markers KLK5, LL-37, PAR2, VEGF was markedly reduced after treatment | Borelli et al., 2017 |
| LL-37, mTORC1 | Rapamycin (mTORC1 inhibition) | RA | Rosacea | 32 rosacea | Mice + cell | Excess cathelicidin LL37 induces both NF-κB activation and disease-characteristic cytokine and chemokine production possibly via mTORC1 signaling. | Deng et al., 2021 |
| LL-37, MCs | Onabotulinum toxin A and B | RA | Rosacea | \ | Mice + cell | In mice, injection of onabotulinum toxin A significantly reduced LL-37-induced skin erythema, mast cell degranulation. | Choi et al., 2019 |
| LL-37, TNF-α | Metformin | RA | Rosacea | \ | Mice + cell | Metformin suppressed LL37- and TNF-α-induced the ROS production and MAPK-NF-κB signal activation in keratinocytes cells. | Li et al., 2021 |
| MMP | Long-pulsed 1064-nm Nd: YAG laser | RA | Rosacea | \ | Mice | LPND improve rosacea by ameliorating dermal connective tissue disorganisation and elastosis through MMPs. | Kim et al., 2018 |
| MMP-8 | Oral Doxycycline | RCT | OcR | 22 OcR, 22 HCs | \ | Doxycycline effectively reduces these pathologically excessive levels and activation of MMP-8. | Määttä et al., 2006 |
| MMP-9 | Oral Doxycycline | RCT | OcR | 21 OcR | \ | MMP-9 did so after doxycycline treatment. | Lam et al., 2018 |
| MMP9, cytokines | Tranexamic acid (TXA) | RA | Rosacea | \ | Mice + cell | Rosacea-like symptoms including skin erythema and histopathological alterations, as well as the elevated pro-inflammatory cytokines (IL-6 and TNFα) and MMP9 expression were significantly ameliorated by TXA treatment. | Li et al., 2019 |
| MMPs | Oral Doxycycline | RA | Rosacea | \ | Cell | Doxycycline inhibits MMP activity in human skin and cultured keratinocytes | Kanada et al., 2012 |
### Table 5 (continued)

| Subtitle | Treatment | Design | Differentiation | Human sample | Cell/ mice | Mechanism | Ref. |
|----------|-----------|--------|-----------------|--------------|------------|-----------|------|
| TLR2     | Oral carvedilol administration | RA | Rosacea         | Mice + cell  | Inhibiting of macrophage TLR2 expression as a novel anti-inflammatory mechanism. | Zhang et al., 2021 |
| TLR2     | siRNAs dispersion in topical emulsions | RA | Rosacea         | Mice + cell  | the interaction of siRNA with combination of excipients, such as urea and glycerol, is likely to favour the siRNA delivery, inducing genetic silencing of TLR2. | Colombo et al., 2019 |
| TLR2, cytokine | Artemisinin (ART) | RA | Rosacea         | Mice + cell  | A decrease of pro-inflammatory factors (IL-1β, IL-6, TNFα) and TLR2 after ART treatment in IL-37-induced rosacea-like mice. | Yuan et al., 2019 |
| TLR2, KLK5, LL-37 | Topical AzA | RA | Rosacea         | Mice + cell  | AzA directly inhibited KLK5 and TLR2, and cathelicidin in mouse skin. | Coda et al., 2015 |
| Macrophage | Paeoniflorin | RA | Rosacea         | Cell         | inhibits the macrophage-related rosacea-like inflammatory reaction through the SOCS3-ASK1-p38 pathway | Liu et al., 2021 |
| MCS      | Topical cromolyn | RCT, RA | PPR | 10 PPR | Cell + mice | A decrease in matrix metalloproteinase activity after treatment. | Moto et al., 2014 |
| Monocytes | Oral carvedilol 5 mg twice daily | RCT | Rosacea         | 18 rosacea  | A decrease in plasma levels of CCL2, HMGB-1, IL-1β and TNF-α after treatment. | Gao et al., 2021 |
| Neutrophils | Sodium bituminosulfonate | RA | Rosacea         | Cell         | SBDS reduces the generation of inflammatory mediators from human neutrophils possibly accounting for its anti-inflammatory effects in rosacea. | Schiffmann et al., 2021 |
| T cell   | Thalidomide | RA | Rosacea         | Mice + cell  | thalidomide reduced CD4+ T helper cell infiltration and downregulated Th1- and Th17-polarizing genes. | Chen et al., 2019 |
| Cytokine | Melatonin (MLT) | RA | Rosacea         | Cell         | MLT treatment significantly improved rosacea-like skin lesion by reducing keratinocyte-mediated inflammatory cytokine secretion. | Zhang et al., 2021 |
| Cytokines | Pioglitazone (PG2) | RA | Rosacea         | \            | PGZ-NE showed good anti-inflammatory efficacy by decreasing the expression of inflammatory cytokines IL-6, IL-1β and TNF-α. | Espinoza et al., 2019 |
| Cytokines | Thermal waters | RA | Rosacea         | Cell         | thermal waters suppress pro-inflammatory cytokines and angiogenic growth factor. | Karagüller et al., 2018 |
| VEGF     | Devices RF irradiation | DS, RA | Rosacea         | 2 rosacea  | RF irradiation attenuated VEGF-induced angiogenesis-associated processes such as tube formation, cell migration and endothelial cell proliferation. | Son et al., 2020 |
| IL-1α    | oral Azithromycin | RCT | OcR             | 21 OcR  | IL-1α levels decreased after azithromycin therapy. | Lam et al., 2018 |
| Immune response | Coptis chinensis Franch | RA | Rosacea         | Cell         | Coptis chinensis improved rosacea by regulating the immune response and angiogenesis, and revealed its mechanism of action | Roh et al., 2020 |
| Lnc RNA NEAT1 | Lnc RNA NEAT1 | RA | Rosacea         | 6 rosacea  | NEAT1 may have functioned as a competing endogenous RNA which regulated in extragastric symptoms of Hp infection probably accounting for its anti-inflammatory effects in rosacea. | Wang et al., 2021 |

### Microorganisms

| H. pylori | Anti-H. pylori therapy | RCT | H. pylori positive patients | 872 H pylori positive patients (167 within rosacea) | H. pylori eradication leads to improvement of rosacea. | Saleh et al., 2017 |
|----------|------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| H. pylori | Anti-H. pylori therapy | RCT | Rosacea | 44 rosacea  | H pylori infection can benefit from eradication therapy, mainly in PPR. | Boixeda et al., 2006 |
| H. pylori | Anti-H. pylori therapy | PS, RCT | Rosacea | 320 rosacea with H pylori | Treating H pylori infection has no short-term beneficial effect on the symptoms of rosacea to support the suggested causal association between H pylori infection and rosacea. | Bamford et al., 1999 |
| H. pylori | Anti-H. pylori therapy | PS, RCT | Rosacea | 25 rosacea, 87 HCs | H. pylori may be involved in rosacea and that eradication treatment may be beneficial. | Uğur et al., 1999 |
| H. pylori | Anti-H. pylori therapy | PS, RCT | Rosacea | 60 rosacea, 60 HCs | Rosacea may be considered as one of the major extragastric symptoms of Hp infection probably mediated by Hp-related cytokotaxins and cytokines. | Szlávich et al., 1999 |
| SIBO     | oral rifaximin | CC | Rosacea | 60 rosacea, 40 HCs | SIBO may trigger rosacea by increasing circulating cytokines, especially tumor necrosis factor-alpha. | Drago et al., 2016 |
| SIBO     | Treat SIBO       | DS | Rosacea within SIBO | 40 Caucasian rosaces within SIBO | Treatment for SIBO is crucial in improvement and maintaining the clinical remission of rosacea. | Drago et al., 2017 |
| Subtitle | Treatment | Design | Differentiation | Human sample | Cell/mice | Mechanism | Ref. |
|----------|-----------|--------|----------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|------|
| Treatment Design Differentiation Human sample Cell/mice | Mechanism | Ref. |
| Demodex | Anti-Demodex therapy | RCT | Rosacea | 25 rosacea | \ | A reduction in the density of Demodex mites in facial skin of patients with rosacea under therapy. | Satler et al., 2015 |
| Gut microbiota | Oral E. coli Nissle | RCT | Intestinal-borne facial dermatoses | 57 acne, PPR, seborrhoic dermatitis | \ | Patients responded to E. coli Nissle therapy with significant amelioration or complete recovery. | Manzhalii et al., 2016 |
| Neurogenetic | TRPV1 | Topical cream with trans-4-t-butylcyclohexanol and licochalcone A | RCT | Sensitive skin and rosacea | 1221 sensitive skin and rosacea | Anti-inflammatory licochalcone A and the TRPV1 antagonist trans-t-butylcyclohexanol in subjects with sensitive skin prone to redness and rosacea. | Jovanovic et al., 2017 |
| | PPARγ | Oral Doxycycline | RA | Rosacea | \ | Cell | Reduced the cell number and increased the lipid content of SZ95 sebocytes in vitro by upregulating PPARγ mRNA levels. | Zouboulis et al., 2021 |
| | PPARγ | PPARγ | RA | Inflammatory skin diseases | \ | Cell | AzA effect involves PPARγ modulation in inflammation and aging. | Briganti et al., 2013 |
| | PPARγ | PGZ | RA | Rosacea | \ | \ | An agonist of PPARs, a nuclear receptor that regulates important cellular functions, including inflammatory responses. | Silva et al., 2017 |
| | PDE5i | PDE5i | CC | Rosacea | 7 ETR, 3 PPR | \ | The NO liberated following administration of PDE5i lead to vessel alterations and induction in rosacea. | Ioannides et al., 2009 |
| Oxidative stress | ROS | Oral Azithromycin | RCT, RA | PPR | 17 PPR, 25 HCs | \ | This study supports the antioxidant properties of azithromycin in rosacea. | Bakar et al., 2007 |
| Oxidative stress | Topical metronidazole | RA | Rosacea | \ | \ | Metronidazole in the treatment of rosacea is probably due to its ability to decrease ROS. | Narayan et al., 2007 |

(KLK5, Kallikrein 5; MMP-3, Matrix metalloproteinase-3; VEGF, Vascular endothelial growth factor; mTORC1, Mechanistic target of rapamycin complex 1; TXA, Tranexamic acid; ART, Artemisinin; MLT, Melatonin; PGZ, Pioglitazone; MCS, Mast cells; TNF-α, Tumor necrosis factor α; TLR2, Toll-like receptor 2; IL-1α, Interleukin 1α; NEAT1, Nuclear-enriched abundant transcript 1; SIBO, Small intestinal bacterial overgrowth; TRPV1, Transient receptor potential vanilloid; PPARγ, Peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor γ; PDE5i, Phosphodiesterase-5 inhibitors; ROS, Reactive oxygen species; GNP, Gold nanoparticles; CB1, Cinnamintannin B; HCQ, Hydroxychloroquine; ssON, Single-stranded oligonucleotide; SAGEs, Semi-synthetic glycosaminoglycan ethers; SOD3, Superoxide dismutase 3; DRG, Dermasence refining gel; PPR, Papulopustular rosacea; OcR, Ocular rosacea; ETR, Erythematotelangiectatic rosacea; HCs, Human controls; ERK, Extracellular signal-regulated kinase; VD3, Vitamin D; NF-eB, Nuclear factor kappa-B; MAPK, Mitogen-activated protein kinase; LPND, yttrium-aluminum-garnet laser; SOCS3-ASK1-p38, Suppressor of cytokine signaling 3-apoptosis signal-regulating kinase 1-p38; HMGB-1, High mobility group box-1; RF, Radiofrequency; NO, nitric oxide.)

Figure 5. The timeline of some key discoveries in the field of the pathogenesis of rosacea. The timeline shows different aspects of pathogenesis in different colors as follows: green—immune, red—neurogenic, orange—barrier, purple—gene, blue—microorganisms. Part of the detailed development has occurred in topics such as cathelicidine/LL-37, mast cells and genes. A guideline with a vital role in the development of rosacea is shown in the second timeline below. MMPs, matrix metalloproteinases; IL-1β, Interleukin-1 beta; TLR, Toll-like receptor; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor; HLA, human leukocyte antigen; ncRNA, noncoding RNA; mTOR, mammalian target of rapamycin; STAT, signal transducers and activators of transcription; H. pylori: Helicobacter pylori; TACR3, tachykinin receptor 3; TEWL, transepidermal water loss; TRPV, transient receptor potential ion channels of vanilloid type; B. oleronius, Bacillus oleronius; CGRP, calcitonin gene-related protein; GC, glucocorticoids; UVR, ultraviolet radiation. (The primary data for this analysis are shown in Tables S 1–6.)
5.4. Neurogenic dysregulation

Strong and universally accepted evidence suggests a potential pathogenesis of neurogenic dysregulation. For example, triggers (stress, spicy food and heat [66]) could be aggravating factors for rosacea. Comorbidity research also suggests a close relationship between neurogenic dysregulation and rosacea, such as psychosis (e.g., anxiety, depression) and neurological disorders (e.g., Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease). Additionally, symptoms (e.g., erythema, itch, and pain) also refer to neurogenic disorders of rosacea. Although the term "neurogenic dysregulation" has been developed in relation to rosacea in the 20th century, the pathogenesis mechanism has been difficult to elucidate, possibly due to limitations in technologies or the heterogeneity of the disease presentation. It has been found that some neurogenic events are regarded as vital components in patients with rosacea (e.g., sympathetic/axon reflex-mediated alterations [67], the neuropeptide calcitonin gene-related peptide (CGRP-α) [68], substance P [69], transient receptor potential vanilloid (TRPV) [70] and the vascular endothelial-derived growth factor (VEGF) family [71]). The
5.5. Inflammation and/or oxidative stress

Interestingly, a large number of studies are related to inflammation and/or ROS, which may be an indispensable event of rosacea. A high rate of inflammatory response has been found in subjects with rosacea (e.g., follicular inflammatory reactions [76], the high-expressed cytokines IL-17 [77] and IL-1β [38]). It seems to be a response or a trigger to immune, microorganisms, and neurogenic dysregulation progression. Thus, these studies have further illuminated the detailed mechanism or triggers of inflammation related to serine protease activity and cathelicidin [14], immune cell infiltration [78], and Demodex mite infection [79]. For instance, mast cell proteases can recruit other immune cells through an inflammatory response, causing vasodilation and angiogenesis [80]. As for first-line strategy, AzA involves the specific activation of peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor γ (PPARγ), which plays a relevant role in inflammation and even in aging processes [81].

5.6. Abnormal barrier function

After suffering from those pathogenetic factors, skin may be dysfunctional featuring increased TEWL, decreased stratum corneum hydration [82], and collagen content [83], which is closely related to ICAM-1 and Claudins (CLDNs, the main components of tight junctions constituting the major barrier) [84]. Thus, various creams and cleaners, such as Cetaphil PRO Redness Control Night Repair Cream, focus on repairing the skin barrier [85]. More related factors have been identified (e.g., UV/sun exposure, Vitamin D, and hormones) and are aiding for therapeutic guidelines.

5.7. Risk factors for pathogenesis

Based on the common triggers for rosacea induction or exacerbation, it may be regarded as an intuitive theory of its macrolevel role in the pathogenesis of rosacea. Current research on risk factors contributing to the disease etiology is focusing on molecular mechanisms. Based on our data, cleansing habits and skin care support barrier function. However, cleansing at a high frequency or with a machine could mechanically break the walls of stem cells [86]. Many studies have been conducted on each of these topics. Risk factors may serve as a guideline and initial factor for pathogenesis studies.

As shown in Table 3, some of the outcomes of risk factors are controversial, such as whether spicy food is a positive risk factor for rosacea. In other words, there may be no specific risk factors associated with rosacea, and a large population-based study is needed to confirm this hypothesis. Additionally, it is important to recognize the control populations included in the study, which should be properly matched in terms of other factors. These factors may be known to influence each other or the rosacea phenotype, such as age, sex, body mass index (BMI), skin type, family history, related food, drug use, and sun exposure. Additionally, the risk factors for rosacea may vary with the phenotypic subtype, so we emphasize the importance of clear subtype inclusion and
the related mechanisms in future studies. Further studies are needed to elucidate the mechanisms underlying this association.

5.8. Comorbidities of pathogenesis

In recent years (especially in 2021), some observational evidence has shown that patients with rosacea have a higher risk of developing various comorbidities, which also highlights the pathogenesis progression in rosacea (Table 4). Regarding gastrointestinal disorders, almost all studies reported a positive relationship with rosacea, such as celiac disease, Crohn's disease, and irritable bowel syndrome (IBS). This can be understood in the context of the microbial pathogenesis of rosacea, which contributes to gastrointestinal disorders, such as H. pylori infection and dysbiosis of intestinal flora (i.e., small intestinal bacterial overgrowth (SIBO)). Psychiatric and neurological disorders have also been reported as positive comorbidities of rosacea (except dementia schizophrenia and migraine), which provides supplementary evidence for neurogenic dysregulation of pathogenesis in rosacea. Studies on rosacea comorbidities may continue to increase, combined with their pathogenetic pathways. However, many more concerns remain for continued research: 1) To date, association studies have failed to identify causal relationships between rosacea and other diseases. For example, rosacea could exert an adverse effect on quality of life, leading to psychiatric disorders. Meanwhile, anxiety disorders and depression may trigger or worsen rosacea. 2) The relationship between some diseases involving a particular system, such as Parkinson's disease in neurological system disorder, could not prove an overall association between the system disease and rosacea. 3) Whether identified comorbidities are positive or negative still needs to be further studied, such as migraine and schizophrenia.

6. Conclusion

Overall, the pathogenesis of rosacea has attracted increasing attention due to the complex interplay and/or co-network of genetic, microorganism, immunological, neurogenic, and barrier factors, further illustrating the chronic rather than acute nature of this inflammatory disease. We have provided a summary of the establishment of the systemic pathogenesis of rosacea in Figure 7. Various factors, such as risk factors and comorbidities, also contribute to the pathogenesis of rosacea. Notably, a growing body of evidence suggests that the pathogenesis of rosacea may play a vital role in systematic pathological changes, as well as in a systemic origin, or be a marker for increased/decreased risk of systemic disease.

7. Limitations

Limited research models of rosacea; diagnostic testing of patients; patient selection protocols; possible confounding factors; non-standardized research data collection and reporting across studies; reliance on research and retrospective studies in the WoS, PubMed, MEDLINE, Embase and Cochrane collaboration databases. Inherent limitations of bibliometrics were reported in others [87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93].
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