British Photodermatology Group Position Statement:

Sunbeds

The British Photodermatology Group (BPG) and the British Association of Dermatology (BAD) advocate for a complete ban on commercial sunbeds in the United Kingdom to protect public health and reduce the incidence of skin cancer and eye disease.

Background:

- Ultraviolet (UV) radiation, including that emitted by sunbeds, has been classified as carcinogenic to humans by the International Agency for Research on Cancer.¹
- Sunbed use is associated with significant increased risk of melanoma and non-melanoma skin cancers, particularly for those who start using sunbeds at a young age.^{2,3}
- Despite existing regulations in the UK restricting sunbed use for under-18s, compliance and enforcement is inadequate. A complete ban is the only way to ensure young people are protected from the significant health risks associated with sunbed use.
- Several countries including Australia and Brazil have already implemented successfully total bans on commercial sunbeds. The Republic of Ireland is currently working towards legislation implementing a ban on solaria too. The UK should follow their lead in prioritizing public health over commercial interests.

Key Evidence:

Cancer Risk:

- Sunbed use before age 35 increases lifetime melanoma risk by as much as 75%.4
- Regular sunbed use in all users is associated with a 20% increased risk of melanoma.⁵
- The risk of squamous cell carcinoma is more than doubled in sunbed users compared to non-users. 6
- It is estimated that sunbed use causes over 450,000 non-melanoma skin cancer cases and 10,000 melanoma cases annually in the US, Europe and Australia combined.⁶
- There are 17,500 new melanoma cases in the UK per year and 2300 deaths. 6% of these are estimated to be caused by sunbeds roughly 100 deaths per year.⁷
- ullet Over the past 30 years, malignant melanoma skin cancer incidence has roughly tripled in the UK. 7
- Epidemiological studies have found an increased risk of ocular melanoma with sunbed use, especially for those who started artificial tanning before 20 years of age.^{8,9}

Young People at Risk:

- Young people, particularly women, are vulnerable to the harms of artificial tanning. 10,11
- Studies show that up to 28% of young adults in the UK have used a sunbed. 10
- Early sunbed use is associated with the highest increase in skin cancer risk.^{2,3,12}
- Sunbed use is addictive and associated with smoking, excessive alcohol consumption, and other unhealthy behaviours. 13,14

Lack of Health Benefits:

- There are no proven health benefits from sunbed use that cannot be obtained more safely through other means.
- Claims of benefits like vitamin D production are not supported by evidence and do not outweigh the risks. 15,16

Ineffectiveness of Current Regulations:

- Existing age restrictions and guidelines have proven difficult to enforce effectively. 17
- Studies show poor compliance with regulations by sunbed operators. 1,18,19
- Self regulation has proven ineffective: Only 16% of sunbed operators in Northern Ireland are currently members of the voluntary Sunbed Association.²⁰
- This situation is mirrored across the UK where local authorities report that licensing sunbeds has proved impossible to implement.¹⁷
- A complete ban is the most straightforward way to eliminate this preventable cancer risk.

Economic Impact:

- Skin cancer treatment places a significant burden on the NHS.
- A ban would likely be cost-effective by reducing future healthcare expenditures related to skin cancer treatment.^{21,22}
- The annual cost to the health system for avoidable skin cancer cases and deaths due to sunbed use is estimated to be in the millions of pounds.^{21,22}

Public Health Benefits of a Ban:

- 1. Cancer Prevention: A ban would prevent thousands of skin cancer cases annually in the UK, including life-threatening melanomas.⁵
- 2. Protection of Young People: It would eliminate access to a known carcinogen for young people who are most vulnerable to the harms.¹⁰
- 3. Healthcare Cost Savings: Reducing skin cancer incidence would result in significant savings for the NHS in treatment costs.^{21,22}
- 4. Clear Public Health Message: A ban would send an unambiguous message about the dangers of artificial tanning and help shift cultural attitudes to suntanning in general.
- 5. Simplified Enforcement: A complete ban is more straightforward to implement and enforce than complex regulations.

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis:

A cost-effectiveness analysis of implementing a nationwide ban on commercial indoor tanning combined with a public information campaign in England found:

- Reductions of 4.8% in melanoma cases (n=1,206), 4.6% in melanoma deaths (n=207) and 3.3% in numbers of keratinocyte cancers (n=3,987) over the lifetime of the 2019 cohort of 18-year-olds.²¹
- \bullet An additional 497 quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) with a cost-saving to NHS England of £697,858. ²¹
- An incremental net benefit of £10.6 million and a net health benefit of 530 QALYs.

• At a cost-effectiveness threshold of £20,000 per QALY, there is a 99% likelihood of the intervention being cost-effective.²¹

Implementation Considerations:

- •There are an estimated 5200 tanning shops in the UK, with a higher density in deprived areas. There are hotspots in the Northwest and Northeast of England.
- Provide a transition period for businesses to adapt and offer support for shifting to safer services like spray tanning.
- Implement strong enforcement mechanisms and penalties for non-compliance.
- Pair the ban with public education campaigns on the risks of UV exposure and importance of sun protection. 21,23,24
- Consider restrictions on private sunbed ownership and use to prevent shifting the risk.
- Empower local authorities to enforce the ban, with powers to inspect premises and issue fixed penalty notices.
- •The success of the banning of sunbeds in Australia provides a model for us to copy. 24

Public Support:

A survey by Cancer Research UK suggested that 90% of the public supported a ban on under 18s using sunbeds. 77% of dermatologist support a ban in the UK and 94% agree that unregulated tanning salons contribute to skin cancer cases.^{25,26}

Conclusion:

Artificial tanning poses an unnecessary and preventable cancer risk, particularly to young people. Existing regulations have proven inadequate in protecting public health. A complete ban on commercial sunbeds is justified and necessary to reduce skin cancer incidence in the UK. We urge policymakers to take decisive action to protect public health by implementing a total ban on commercial sunbeds across the UK. This evidence-based, cost effective policy would prevent needless suffering, save lives, and reduce healthcare costs.

References

- 1 El Ghissassi F, Baan R, Straif K, *et al.* A review of human carcinogens--part D: radiation. *Lancet Oncol* 2009; **10**:751–2.
- 2 Boniol M, Autier P, Boyle P, Gandini S. Cutaneous melanoma attributable to sunbed use: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2012; **345**:e4757.
- Wehner MR, Shive ML, Chren M-M, *et al.* Indoor tanning and non-melanoma skin cancer: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2012; **345**:e5909.
- 4 Elliott, A & Waters, Raymond & Atkinson, T & Baillie-Johnson, Hr & Dale, R & Gibson, C & Hodgson, Shirley & Jeggo, Penny & Maskell, G & Mason, M & Mitchell, C & Murphy, Michael & Shields, R & Stratford, I & Verne, J & Wakeford, Richard & McKenna, G & Mckinney, Patricia & Wright, E & Kedward, J. COMARE's 13th report: The health effects and risks arising from exposure to ultraviolet radiation from artificial tanning devices., 2009.
- Gandini S, Doré J-F, Autier P, et al. Epidemiological evidence of carcinogenicity of sunbed use and of efficacy of preventive measures. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol* 2019; **33 Suppl 2**:57–62.

- Wehner MR, Chren M-M, Nameth D, et al. International prevalence of indoor tanning: a systematic review and meta-analysis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Dermatol* 2014; **150**:390–400.
- 7 Melanoma skin cancer statistics [WWW Document]. Cancer Research UK. 2015.URL https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type/melanoma-skin-cancer [accessed on 17 January 2025].
- 8 IARC. Non-ionizing radiation., IARC, 2014.
- World Health Organization. Artificial tanning devices: public health interventions to manage sunbeds., World Health Organization, 2017URL https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=ZGNnDwAAQBAJ.
- 10 Rush J. 28% of UK adults are using sunbeds as skin cancer rates rise [WWW Document]. Melanoma Focus. 2024.URL https://melanomafocus.org/news-blog/28-of-uk-adults-are-using-sunbeds-as-skin-cancer-rates-rise/ [accessed on 17 January 2025].
- 11 Schneider S, Krämer H. Who uses sunbeds? A systematic literature review of risk groups in developed countries: Who uses sunbeds? A systematic review. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol* 2010; **24**:639–48.
- 12 Cust AE, Armstrong BK, Goumas C, *et al.* Sunbed use during adolescence and early adulthood is associated with increased risk of early-onset melanoma. *Int J Cancer* 2011; **128**:2425–35.
- LaMonte OC, Feldman SR. Indoor Tanning Addiction: Biological mechanisms and association with other disorders. *J Cutan Med Surg* 2024; :12034754241303136.
- Petit A, Lejoyeux M, Reynaud M, Karila L. Excessive indoor tanning as a behavioral addiction: a literature review. *Curr Pharm Des* 2014; **20**:4070–5.
- Woo DK, Eide MJ. Tanning beds, skin cancer, and vitamin D: An examination of the scientific evidence and public health implications. *Dermatol Ther* 2010; **23**:61–71.
- Opinion on Biological effects of ultraviolet radiation relevant to health with particular reference to sunbeds for cosmetic purposes. *European Commission* 2016.
- 17 All Party Parliamentary Group on Skin. . IINQUIRY INTO SUNBED REGULATION IN ENGLAND: CONSULTATION SUMMARY AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH [WWW Document]. All Party Parliamentary Group on Skin. 2014.URL https://www.appgs.co.uk/.
- Dobbinson S, Wakefield M, Sambell N. Access to commercial indoor tanning facilities by adults with highly sensitive skin and by under-age youth: compliance tests at solarium centres in Melbourne, Australia. *Eur J Cancer Prev* 2006; **15**:424–30.
- 19 Gavin A, Donnelly C, Devlin A, et al. Public at risk: a survey of sunbed parlour operating practices in Northern Ireland. *Br J Dermatol* 2010; **162**:627–32.
- 20 The Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety (DHSSPS), Regulation of the Sunbed Industry in Northern Ireland, Consultation Report: A summary of responses and Departmental Decisions., 2010.

- 21 Eden M, Hainsworth R, Gordon LG, et al. Cost-effectiveness of a policy-based intervention to reduce melanoma and other skin cancers associated with indoor tanning. *Br J Dermatol* 2022; **187**:105–14.
- 22 Guy GP, Machlin SR, Ekwueme DU, Yabroff KR. Prevalence and costs of skin cancer treatment in the U. S., 2002-2006 and 2007-2011. *Am J Prev Med* 2002; **48**:183–7.
- 23 Gordon LG, Sinclair C, Cleaves N, *et al.* Consequences of banning commercial solaria in 2016 in Australia. *Health Policy* 2020; **124**:665–70.
- 24 Sinclair CA, Makin JK, Tang A, et al. The role of public health advocacy in achieving an outright ban on commercial tanning beds in Australia. *Am J Public Health* 2014; **104**:e7-9.
- 25 Cancer Research UK. Public want ban on sunbeds for under 18s [WWW Document]. Cancer Research UK - Cancer News. 2009.URL https://news.cancerresearchuk.org/2009/07/16/public-want-ban-on-sunbeds-for-under-18s/ [accessed on 17 January 2025].
- 77% of dermatologists agree sunbeds should be banned in the UK [WWW Document]. British Skin Foundation. URL https://www.britishskinfoundation.org.uk/news/77-of-dermatologists-agree-sunbeds-should-be-banned-in-the-uk [accessed on 17 January 2025].