Intertriginous Drug Eruption

RONNI WOLF, SARAH BRENNER and ANATOL KRAKOWSKI

Department of Dermatology, Tel-Aviv Sourasky Medical Center, Ichilov Hospital and Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Tel-Aviv University, Israel

Presented are two patients who developed an unusual, and as yet unreported eruption due to amoxycillin. They exhibited an eruption confined to the intertriginous areas, which mimicked intertrigo. Although drug eruption can mimic a variety of idiopathic skin diseases, intertrigo is easily distinguished from drug eruption and has not been mentioned in the differential diagnosis of this reaction.

It is suggested that drug reactions should be considered in the differential diagnosis of intertrigo, in particular of atypical and therapy-resistant cases. Early detection of these cases has practical importance since the elimination of the causative drug is essential for therapy success. Case 2 showed a response of the toxic epidermal neurolysis (TEN) type, which could have been very severe and dangerous had the diagnosis not been made in an early stage before the development of generalized TEN.

(Accepted May 25, 1992.)

Acta Derm Venereol (Stockh) 1992; 72: 441-442.

R. Wolf, Department of Dermatology, Ichilov Hospital, 6 Weizman St., Tel-Aviv 64239, Israel.

"Drug eruption is an age-old but always timely and fascinating subject" (1) for both clinicians and researchers. The manifestations of drug-induced side effects in dermatology are so manifold that drug reactions might be considered to have replaced syphilis as the great imitator.

Drug eruption can mimic a variety of idiopathic skin diseases, including psoriasis (2, 3), lichen planus and lichenoid eruptions (4, 5), pityriasis rosea (6), atopic dermatitis (7, 8), mycosis fungoides (9), acneiform eruptions (10), bullous eruptions like pemphigus vulgaris (11), bullous pemphigoid (12) and many others.

Intertrigo, however, is easily distinguished from drug eruptions and has not been mentioned in the differential diagnosis of this reaction.

presented are two patients with an unusual, and as yet unreported form of drug reaction. They exhibited an eruption confined to the intertriginous areas, which mimicked intertrigo.

CASE REPORTS

Case 1

A 35-year-old woman was admitted to our clinic for evaluation of an erythematous pruritic rash of 10 days' duration in the inguinal and intergluteal areas. The patient's condition had been diagnosed elsewhere as candida intertrigo and although the microscopic examination with KOH and cultures on Sabouraud's agar were negative, she was being treated with a cream containing isoconazole nitrate 10 mg, and diflucortolone valerate 1/mg/G. The eruption, however, had not only failed to respond, but had in fact spread, and had appeared in the axillary folds. The patient's history revealed that she was a healthy woman, and that 2 days prior to the appearance of the rash she had

started treatment with amoxycillin for urinary tract infection. In the past she had developed a widespread eruption after taking ampicillin.

Our initial examination revealed symmetrical erythematous edematous plaques in the inguinal, intergluteal and axillar areas (Fig. 1).

Since the usual and appropriate treatment for intertrigo failed to alleviate the skin condition, and the eruption appeared in the axillar area (that had not been treated topically), the possibility of an eruption due to amoxycillin was considered and the drug was discontinued. The patient was instructed to continue topical treatment only on the left inguinal and axillar side and to leave the right inguinal and axillar areas untreated. Within 2 days of withdrawal of the amoxycillin the skin condition improved noticeably, and within 1 week it had cleared completely from both sides of her body.

Case 2

A 32-year-old healthy man was admitted because of an erythematous, erosive, oozing eruption in the genital and inguinal areas that had started a day earlier. Four days prior to the appearance of the eruption, he had received amoxycillin for an upper respiratory tract infection.

Our first examination revealed erythematous, edematous, welldefined plaques in the inguinal, perineal and intergluteal areas with erosions and crust formation. A biopsy specimen obtained from a lesion revealed hydropic degeneration of the basal cells, subepidermal separation, and necrotic keratinocytes in the epidermal tissue. The dermis showed a mild mononuclear infiltrate around the superficial blood vessels. The changes were consistent with toxic epidermal necrolysis (TEN). Repeated cultures for bacteria and fungi were negative.

The amoxycillin was discontinued, and following an initial period of several days during which the skin condition worsened, it started to improve rapidly, and within 10 days his eruption had cleared almost completely and he was discharged.

DISCUSSION

The two patients reported had developed an unusual eruption due to amoxycillin. Evidence of the drug being the cause of the skin eruption is only circumstantial, yet strong. In Case 1 the rash appeared 2 days after the patient started taking amoxycillin. Microscopic examination and cultures ruled out the possibility of fungal infection. The rash did not respond to standard



 $\it Fig.~1.$ Case 1. Symmetrical, erythematous plaques in the inguinal areas.

442

treatment for intertrigo, which usually responds readily. It continued to spread and even appeared in distant areas – in the axilla. As soon as the amoxycillin was discontinued the rash rapidly disappeared. The disappearance of the rash from both sides of the patient's body, in spite of the fact that topical treatment was continued on one side, proves that the topical treatment had no effect – either beneficial or detrimental – and ruled out the possibility of contact dermatitis from the medication. The fact that the patient had developed a rash from a related drug (ampicillin) in the past further supports the diagnosis of a drug eruption in the present case.

Case 2 relates to a dramatic, rapid onset response TEN, confirmed by microscopic examination. Since TEN is almost always a drug reaction (13), and in view of the patient's history and the course of the current illness, one can assume that the rash was a reaction to amoxycillin.

It must be noted that the above cases are not the only cases of intertrigo-like drug reactions we have come across. We have, in fact, seen other similar cases in the past, but these two are the first well documented cases we have dealt with. We believe that this is by no means a rare phenomenon, and that many such cases have been overlooked and/or misdiagnosed.

The differential diagnosis of intertrigo includes many skin diseases such as seborrheic dermatitis, intertriginous psoriasis, erythrasma, contact dermatitis, fungal and bacterial infections and others. Drug reaction has never been mentioned in the differential diagnosis of intertrigo. It is true that drug reactions can imitate many types of skin conditions, but the picture is usually one of a widespread rash. That would explain why when faced with a localized rash, as in our case, the clinician is unlikely to think of a drug reaction – hence the importance of this report.

We suggest that drug reactions should be considered in the differential diagnosis of intertrigo, in particular atypical and therapy-resistant cases of intertrigo. We believe that the presentation of the cases will lead to the diagnosis of many more such cases that would otherwise have been overlooked and/or misdiagnosed. Apart from the theoretical considerations, the question of the localization of, and immunologic mechanisms involved in the development of drug reactions, detection of

these cases also has practical importance, since the elimination of the causative drug is essential for therapy success. Case 2 showed a response of the TEN type, which could have been very severe and dangerous had the lesions spread widely. The early diagnosis and appropriate treatment (with drawal of the offending drug) before the lesions spread may, therefore, be critical

REFERENCES

- Bear RL, Witten VH. Drug eruptions. A review. In: Year book of dermatology, Series 1960–61, 1961: 9–37.
- Gold MH, Holy AK, Roenik Jr, HH, Beta-blocking drugs and psoriasis. A review of cutaneous side effects and retrospective analysis of their effects on psoriasis. J Am Acad Dermatol 1988; 19: 837–841.
- Wolf R, Tamir A, Brenner S. Psoriasis related to angiotensinconverting enzyme inhibitors. Dermatologica 1990; 18i: 51–53.
- Anderson TE. Lichen planus following quinidine therapy. Br J Dermatol 1967; 75: 500.
- Wolf R, Dorfman B, Krakowski A. Quinidine-induced lichenoid and eczematous photodermatitis. Dermatologica 1987; 174: 285– 289.
- Wolf R, Wolf D, Livni E. pityriasis rosea and Ketotifen. Dermatologica 1985; 171: 355–365.
- Wolf R, Kahane E. Atopic dermatitis-like eruption with elevated IgE levels possibly due to chenodeoxycholic acid. Cutis 1987; 40: 373–374.
- Wolf R, Ophir J, Yust I. Atopic dermatitis provoked by AL 721 in a patient with acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. Ann Allergy 1991; 66: 421–423.
- Wolf R, Kahana E, Sandbank M. Mycosis fungoides-like lesions associated with phenytoin therapy. Arch Dermatol 1985; 121: 1181–1182.
- Hitch JM. Acneiform eruptions induced by drugs and chemicals. JAMA 1967; 200: 879.
- Wolf R, Tamir S, Brenner S. Drug-induced versus drug-triggered pemphigus. Dermatologica 1991; 182: 207–210.
- Halevy S, Livni E, Sandbank M, Feuerman EJ. Bullous pemphigoid associated with furosemide therapy report of two cases. Harefuah 1984; 106: 125–126.
- Schopf E, Stuhmer A, Rzany B, Victor N, Zentgraf R, Friedrich-Kapp J. Toxic epidermal necrolysis and Stevens-Johnson syndrome. An epidemiologic study from West Germany. Arch Dermatol 1991; 127: 839–842.