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Introduction

Photopatch tests (PPT) are indicated for the diagnosis of photoallergic contact dermatitis (PACD). This is a delayed hypersensitivity reaction that occurs when a photoallergen is applied to the skin subsequently exposed to visible and/or ultraviolet (UV) radiation. Its incidence is unknown, estimated at 2-10% of patients referred for photodermatosis investigation.

Patients and Methods - Results

Patients treated at the Contact Dermatitis Outpatient Clinic at Hospital das Clínicas – UFMG - Belo Horizonte between 2007 and 2019, who had been suspected to have photodermatitis after patch testing to the Brazilian standard series (BSS) were selected for the PPT for diagnostic purposes. FDA-Allergenic – RJ - Brazil and Chemotechnique Diagnostics - Sweden allergens (table 1) were used in Finn Chambers’ on Scantor® (Smartpractice-USA) or Allergochambers® (Neoflex - São Paulo - Brazil) applied in duplicate to the back skin. Removed 48 hours later, readings were taken and an allergen set was covered with a surgical pad and aluminum foil. As no patient presented a minimum erythematous dose lower than 10 J/cm² of UVA, the other allergen set was irradiated with this dose in all patients, which was followed by immediate reading and subsequent occlusion. New readings in both sets were performed 48 hours later, following ICDRG criteria. (International Contact Dermatitis Research Group). If only the irradiated side showed a positive reaction, the diagnosis was photoallergic contact dermatitis (PACD) and photoallergic contact dermatitis (ACD), and if the reactions were equal on both sides, allergic contact dermatitis (ACD). (5)

Among 1,712 patch tested patients, we selected 37 (2.2%), 19 men (51.4%) and 18 women (48.6%), aged 30-80 years, 22 (59.4%) of phototypes II and III, 7 (19%) IV and V and 8 (21.6%) VI. Six patients (16.2%) had a personal history of atopy, 15 (40.5%) related photo protection with sunscreens, 31 (84%) had varied professions, 4 (11%) were bricklayers and 2 (5.4%) farmers. The duration of the lesions ranged from 5 months to 20 years and the most affected sites were exposed areas.

Three patients (8%) presented disseminated lesions. The previous contact test showed reactions to Kathon and Quaternium 15 in one patient, Formaldehyde in one, Nickel, Thimerosal and Hydroquinone in one and Potassium Dichromate in two. Seventy four positive reactions were observed, 54 on irradiated side and 20 on non-irradiated side. Photoallergic contact dermatitis (PACD) was diagnosed in 23 (62%) patients and allergic contact dermatitis (ACD) in 12 (32%). The photoallergic reactions detected were to Chlorpromazine (n = 9, 24%), Balsam Peru (n = 6, 16%), Perfume mix (n=5, 13.5%), Promethazine, Chlorhexedine and Potassium Dichromate (n = 4, 11%), Oxybenzone and BHT ( n = 3, 8%), Paraphenylenediamine and Compositae mix (n = 2, 5.4%), Sesquiterpene Lactona mix, Thiourea and Butylmethoxybenzoylecetone (n = 1.27%).
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Among 1,712 patch tested patients, we selected 37 (2.2%), 19 men (51.4%) and 18 women (48.6%), aged 30-80 years, 22 (59.4%) of phototypes II and III, 7 (19%) IV and V and 8 (21.6%) VI. Six patients (16.2%) had a personal history of atopy, 15 (40.5%) related photo protection with sunscreens, 31 (84%) had varied professions, 4 (11%) were bricklayers and 2 (5.4%) farmers. The duration of the lesions ranged from 5 months to 20 years and the most affected sites were exposed areas.

Three patients (8%) presented disseminated lesions. The previous contact test showed reactions to Kathon and Quaternium 15 in one patient, Formaldehyde in one, Nickel, Thimerosal and Hydroquinone in one and Potassium Dichromate in two. Seventy four positive reactions were observed, 54 on irradiated side and 20 on non-irradiated side. Photoallergic contact dermatitis (PACD) was diagnosed in 23 (62%) patients and allergic contact dermatitis (ACD) in 12 (32%). The photoallergic reactions detected were to Chlorpromazine (n = 9, 24%), Balsam Peru (n = 6, 16%), Perfume mix (n=5, 13.5%), Promethazine, Chlorhexedine and Potassium Dichromate (n = 4, 11%), Oxybenzone and BHT ( n = 3, 8%), Paraphenylenediamine and Compositae mix (n = 2, 5.4%), Sesquiterpene Lactona mix, Thiourea and Butylmethoxybenzoylecetone (n = 1.27%).

Reactions to chlorpromazine were the most frequent in the patients investigated, as it was observed in a Chinese series. It is a phenothiazine-derived antipsychotic whose analogues such as dihydrochlorothiazide and promethazine are widely used as a diuretic and antipruritic drug in Brazil. Promethazine was the fourth photoallergen as well as chlorhexedine and potassium dichromate, but only one patient showed co-reaction between chlorpromazine and promethazine. The second in frequency was Balsam of Peru, followed by Perfume Mix. Differences in the pattern of photopositivity vary according to the geographical area and the population studied. This is a preliminary investigation that reflects some habits of the Brazilian population, such as the oral and topical use of promethazine as antipruritic drug and the professional or domestic exposure to cement.

A Brazilian standardized PPT series like the one described above is suggested, as it is an effective and important tool in the diagnosis of photosensitive dermatitis.
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