



ACTAS Dermo-Sifiliográficas

Full English text available at
www.actasdermo.org



REVIEW

[Translated article] Exploring New Horizons in Allergic Contact Dermatitis Treatment: The Role of Emerging Therapies



I. Rivera-Ruiz^{a,b}, A. Gil-Villalba^c, F.J. Navarro-Triviño^{d,e,*}

^a Dermatology Department, Hospital Universitario Reina Sofía de Córdoba, Córdoba, Spain

^b Inflammatory Immune-mediated Chronic Skin Diseases Laboratory, Instituto Maimónides de Investigación Biomédica de Córdoba (IMIBIC)/Reina Sofia University Hospital/University of Cordoba, Córdoba, Spain

^c Dermatology Department, Hospital Universitario San Cecilio, Granada, Spain

^d Contact Eczema and Immunoallergic Diseases Department, Dermatology, Hospital Universitario San Cecilio, Granada, Spain

^e Instituto de Investigación Biosanitaria ibs, Granada, Spain

Received 15 August 2024; accepted 9 October 2024

Available online 28 May 2025

KEYWORDS

Allergic contact dermatitis;
New therapies;
JAK inhibitors;
Biologic drugs

Abstract The resistant and recalcitrant nature of severe allergic contact dermatitis (ACD) makes treatment challenging. With advances in the understanding of the cellular and molecular pathogenesis of this dermatosis, new therapeutic options are emerging. In particular, the use of biologic drugs such as dupilumab and small molecule inhibitors, such as JAK inhibitors have gained momentum given the cross-cutting inhibition of multiple cytokine actions. This article aims to review the current available data on the use of biologic drugs and small molecule inhibitor drugs in the management of ACD. Results suggest that iJAKs, such as abrocitinib, tofacitinib, upadacitinib, and baricitinib; although biologic drugs, such as dupilumab show significant promise in refractory ACD, more long-term clinical trials are needed to confirm their safety and efficacy profile.

© 2025 AEDV. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

PALABRAS CLAVE

Dermatitis de contacto alérgica;
Nuevas terapias;
Inhibidores de JAK;
Fármacos biológicos

Nuevas fronteras en el tratamiento de la dermatitis de contacto alérgica: el rol de las terapias emergentes

Resumen La naturaleza resistente y recalcitrante de la dermatitis de contacto alérgica (DCA) grave hace que su tratamiento sea desafiante. Con los avances en la comprensión de la patogénesis celular y molecular de esta dermatosis, están surgiendo nuevas opciones terapéuticas. En

DOI of original article: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ad.2024.10.068>

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: fntmed@gmail.com (F.J. Navarro-Triviño).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ad.2025.05.016>

0001-7310/© 2025 AEDV. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

particular, el uso de fármacos biológicos como dupilumab e inhibidores de moléculas pequeñas (como los inhibidores de JAK) han cobrado impulso, dada la inhibición transversal de las acciones de múltiples citoquinas. Este artículo tiene como objetivo revisar los datos disponibles actuales sobre el uso de fármacos biológicos y fármacos inhibidores de moléculas pequeñas en la DCA. Los resultados sugieren que los iJAK, como abrocitinib, tofacitinib, upadacitinib y baricitinib; y los fármacos biológicos, como dupilumab, muestran promesas significativas en la DCA refractaria, aunque se necesitan más ensayos clínicos a largo plazo para confirmar su eficacia y seguridad. © 2025 AEDV. Publicado por Elsevier España, S.L.U. Este es un artículo Open Access bajo la CC BY-NC-ND licencia (<http://creativecommons.org/licencias/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Introduction

Contact dermatitis accounts for an estimated 4–7% of dermatological consultations.¹ The prevalence of allergic contact dermatitis (ACD) is unknown, although some studies have estimated it to be between 1.7% and 9.8%,² with occupational ACD being particularly significant.³ ACD presents with different clinical patterns depending on the affected area. Recognizing these patterns can not only aid physicians in diagnosis but also suggest potential allergens and forms of contact.⁴ The gold standard for investigating these patients remains patch testing, with a relevant positivity rate between 15% and 20.1% of patched patients.⁵ All patients should be tested with the national standard series,⁶ their own products,⁷ and, depending on the case characteristics and exposure sources, additional commercially available specific series. Identifying the responsible allergens and avoiding them is not always sufficient to resolve the problem, requiring the prescription of topical and/or systemic immunosuppressive treatment in refractory cases. The lack of response to allergen avoidance and the limitations of traditional treatments highlight the need for new therapies.⁸ Recent research into small molecule inhibitors and biological drugs offers new hope, especially for those who do not respond to conventional approaches.

In the routine clinical practice, it may not be possible to perform patch testing after suspending immunosuppressive medication, which increases the risk of false negatives.⁹ Patients with polysensitization (3 or more allergens) on patch tests are a difficult-to-manage group, with an increased risk of refractoriness after attempting avoidance.¹⁰

In recent years, there has been progress in understanding the pathophysiology of ACD and the different groups of allergens.¹¹ This information provides an opportunity to consider advanced targeted treatments, off-label, for the control of ACD refractory to the avoidance of identified allergens. During the initial phase of the type IV hypersensitivity process, the innate immune system actively participates after the formation of the antigenic complex, inducing the release of cytokines such as IL-1 α , IL-1 β , TNF- α , IL-8, IL-18, and granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor.¹² Prior to the sensitization phase, the antigen-presenting cell captures the hapten to present it to naive T lymphocytes in the regional lymph node, which can recognize it and activate the Th1 pathway if IL-12 is released, Th2 if IL-4 is released, Th17 if IL-17 or IL-23 is released, or Th22 if IL-22 is released.^{13,14} Activation

of regulatory T lymphocytes is also possible. In the last decade, the inflammatory specificity of some allergens has been more precisely defined, such as nickel sulfate with predominantly Th1 and Th17 cytokines, fragrances with predominantly Th2 inflammation, and rubber (latex) related to Th2 and Th22 type inflammation.¹⁴ Table 1 illustrates the main allergens studied from a molecular point of view and the inflammatory pathways they activate.

Understanding that assigning specific immunogenic profiles to each allergen (or group of them) can be complex, and that we are likely talking about inflammatory predominances, the use of drugs with specific therapeutic targets in these patients remains interesting. Currently, and broadly speaking, we can classify therapeutic options into two groups: small molecule inhibitors such as Janus kinase inhibitors (JAKi), and biological therapies (monoclonal antibodies directed against IL-4, 13, 17, 12, 23, immunoglobulin E [IgE], and TNF- α). None of these commercially available treatments are approved for the treatment of ACD; therefore, their request will be off-label.⁸

This review excluded the study of classic immunosuppressants, such as corticosteroids, cyclosporine, methotrexate, mycophenolate, or azathioprine, in the treatment of ACD.¹⁵ This decision was made because these do not represent novel treatments.

Material and methods

We conducted a narrative literature review on PubMed up to July 28th, 2024, using specific terms related to ACD and new therapies: "allergic contact dermatitis," "allergens," "delayed-type hypersensitivity reaction," "patch test," "Jak inhibitors," "iJak," "biologics," "biological therapy," "monoclonal antibodies," "abrocitinib," "tofacitinib," "upadacitinib," "baricitinib," "ruxolitinib," "degocitinib," "apremilast," "roflumilast," "crisaborol," "difamilast," "dupilumab," "tralokinumab," "nemolizumab," "lebrizumab," "secukinumab," "ustekinumab," "omalizumab," "anti-TNF," "infliximab," "adalimumab," "etanercept," "certolizumab," and "certolizumab pegol." Studies in English and Spanish evaluating the safety and efficacy profile of small molecule inhibitors and biological drugs in ACD were included. Studies focused on traditional treatments, such as corticosteroids and classic immunosuppressants, were excluded given their non-novel nature. Articles were selected based on the relevance of

Table 1 Allergen, molecular profile, and main reference.

Allergen	Molecular profile	Main reference
Nickel	Predominantly Th1 and Th17 polarization	14
Fragrances	Predominantly Th2 polarization	14
Rubber (latex)	Predominantly Th2 and Th22 polarization	14,39

their abstracts and were evaluated in detail after full-text reading.

Small molecule inhibitors

JAK inhibitors (JAKi): abrocitinib, tofacitinib, upadacitinib, baricitinib, ruxolitinib, and delgocitinib

The intracellular signaling pathway Janus kinase/signal transducer and activator of transcription (JAK/STAT) is initiated when an extracellular ligand binds to transmembrane receptors, leading to the phosphorylation of intracellular molecules. This triggers an intracellular signaling cascade and regulates the transcription of numerous genes. JAKs are part of this family of tyrosine kinases that function as intracellular signal transducers and include JAK1, JAK2, JAK3, and TYK2. JAKs form dimers in the intracellular cytoplasmic portion of cytokine receptors, allowing them to associate with multiple receptors and be activated by different cytokines. In turn, they activate various STAT proteins, such as STAT1, STAT2, STAT3, STAT4, STAT5a, STAT5b, and STAT6, thus participating in specific biological functions. When these STAT proteins are activated, they associate forming dimers and can translocate to the cell nucleus. There, they act as transcription factors, upregulating the expression of genes responsible for the production of pro-inflammatory cytokines and growth factors, and regulating the behavior of other intracellular proteins.¹⁶ JAKi have emerged as a therapeutic class with multiple applications in dermatology (vitiligo, alopecia areata, psoriasis, and atopic dermatitis).^{17,18} It is postulated that JAKi could be a promising therapeutic option in cases resistant to conventional therapies for ACD.¹⁹ These drugs have been shown to influence multiple inflammatory pathways, including the TH1, TH2, and TH17 pathways that are involved in the pathophysiology of ACD.²⁰ The efficacy of JAKi may vary depending on the specific allergen involved, highlighting the importance of an individualized evaluation. Although clinical research in this field is still limited, cases have been documented where treatment with JAKi showed encouraging results. For example, the use of abrocitinib at a dose of 100 mg every 24 h in a 37-year-old man with airborne ACD caused by plant particles of the *Compositae* (Asteraceae) family, with occupational exposure in a work environment where allergen avoidance was unfeasible, resulted in complete resolution of symptoms 8 months into therapy without adverse effects.²¹ This patient had previously shown a lack of response to treatment with dupilumab 300 mg every 2 weeks for 11 months, suggesting that the allergen in question activates other inflammatory pathways not related to the Th2 pathway.

Another case reported the therapeutic success of tofacitinib 5 mg every 12 h after a 4-week regimen without side effects in a 57-year-old Indian woman with airborne ACD to *Parthenium*, a genus of plants in the *Compositae* (Asteraceae) family.²² This patient had previously been on topical and oral corticosteroids, topical tacrolimus 0.1%, and azathioprine without response. These findings support the viability of JAKi as a therapeutic option in selected cases of ACD.

Recently, 2 cases of patients with psoriasis and ACD to fragrance mix I and balsam of Peru, with good response to upadacitinib 15 mg daily, have been published.²³ The use of upadacitinib 30 mg also silenced the allergic reaction to multiple allergens (corticosteroids, lanolin, thiuram mix, 4-tert-butylphenol formaldehyde resin) when repeating patch tests in the same patient after 4 months of into upadacitinib 30 mg.²⁴ This is important not only because it may be an interesting therapeutic tool but also to avoid performing patch tests in patients on this type of drug due to the high risk of false negatives. We have experience treating ACD with rubber accelerators (thiuram mix, carba mix, and mercaptobenzothiazole) in a patient refractory to cyclosporine, who responded completely within 4 weeks into baricitinib 2 mg/24 h (Fig. 1). We have not found any published cases of ACD on topical ruxolitinib or delgocitinib, but we suspect that after their commercialization, new cases of ACD treated with these topical drugs will be published. Table 2 illustrates the findings regarding JAKi in the treatment of ACD.

Phosphodiesterase 4 inhibitors (PDE4i): apremilast, roflumilast, crisaborol, and difamilast

Phosphodiesterase 4 (PDE4) is an enzyme responsible for the degradation of cyclic adenosine monophosphate (cAMP), which promotes the production of inflammatory mediators (cytokines: TNF- α , IL-1 β , and IL-6) and the activation of immune cells (T lymphocytes, macrophages, and mast cells) systemically and epidermally. The use of PDE4i in ACD would help limit the inflammatory response and preserve the skin barrier function against allergens and irritants. There are few publications on their use in ACD. Apremilast was used in an open-label phase 2 trial for recalcitrant ACD and/or AD, in which 10 patients participated at a dose of 20 mg twice daily for a period of 12 weeks, 4 of whom had ACD and 1, coexisting ACD and AD.²⁵ The primary endpoint was set at a 2-point improvement in the IGA (Investigator Global Assessment), which was achieved in 20% of the subjects. Only 10% achieved EASI-75 (Eczema Area and Severity Index-75), leading to the conclusion of its limited effect for these patients vs the results obtained in psoriasis.²⁵ However, an interesting finding was observed



Figure 1 Patient with ACD to thiuram mix, carba mix, and mercaptobenzothiazole (A and B) on baricitinib 2 mg every 24 h with complete response at 4 weeks (C and D).

Table 2 JAK inhibitors (iJAK): drug, mechanism of action, ACD with sensitization to relevant present allergen treatable or capable of silencing on patch tests, study type, response, and reference.

Drug	Mechanism of action	Allergen treated	Study type	Response	Reference
Abrocitinib (100 mg/24 h)	iJAK 1	<i>Compositae</i> plant species (airborne)	Case report (N = 1)	CR	21
Tofacitinib (5 mg/24 h)	Pan-JAK inhibitor	<i>Compositae</i> plant species (airborne)	Case report (N = 1)	CR	22
Upadacitinib (15 mg/24 h)	iJAK 1	Fragrance mix I, balsam of Peru	Case series (N = 2)	CR	23
Upadacitinib (30 mg/24 h)	iJAK 1	Corticosteroids, lanolin, thiuram mix, 4-tert-butylphenol formaldehyde resin	Case report (N = 1)	CR	24
Baricitinib (2 mg/24 h)	iJAK 1 and 2	Thiuram mix, carba mix, mercaptobenzothiazole	Real-world experience (N = 1)	CR	<i>Hospital Universitario Clínico San Cecilio, Granada (Spain)</i>

ACD: allergic contact dermatitis; CR: complete response.

No data on delgocitinib, ruxolitinib, roflumilast, or difamilast. Topical crisaborol can cause ACD.^{[29,30](#)}

in this trial: subjects diagnosed with ACD responded better to apremilast vs patients with AD. ACD patients showed an average improvement of 40% in the EASI score, while AD patients experienced a 20% worsening ($p = 0.026$). Furthermore, ACD subjects presented a 30% reduction in pruritus,

in contrast to a 10% reduction in AD patients. However, this difference in pruritus was not statistically significant, likely due to the small sample size. This finding suggests that apremilast might be more effective in the treatment of ACD than AD, although it should be noted that ACD patients had

lower baseline EASI scores, with a mean of 12.5, compared to AD patients, who had a mean of 34.1; therefore, a larger number of patients is needed to confirm these results.²⁵

Roflumilast is a drug indicated for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) that has shown promising results in the treatment of recurrent oral aphthosis, lichen planus, psoriasis, and AD, among others.²⁶ A phase IIa clinical trial (NCT04773587) with roflumilast cream at 0.15% and 0.015% vs placebo demonstrated a good safety profile with a decrease in EASI of 6.4 points in the roflumilast 0.15% group, 6 points in the roflumilast 0.05% group, and 4.8 points in the control group, without being statistically significant, in adults and children older than 6 years with mild-to-moderate AD.²⁷ However, another phase IIa clinical trial (NCT01856764) on topical roflumilast 0.5% vs placebo for the management of AD did not achieve results superior to placebo in the roflumilast group.²⁸ Despite the lack of evidence of roflumilast efficacy in ACD, its safety profile and anti-inflammatory potential may motivate its use in selected cases.

Regarding other topical drugs, crisaborol is the first topical PDE4i approved for AD since 2020 for individuals older than 3 months as a corticosteroid-sparing treatment. No publications on its use in ACD have been found; in fact, there are 2 recent articles that postulate it as a potential allergen.^{29,30} Difamylast is another topical PDE4i currently in phase 3 study for the treatment of AD, approved in Japan since 2021 for individuals older than 2 years. It has demonstrated rapid-acting anti-inflammatory and antipruritic effects from the first week of treatment.³¹ We have also found no data on its use in ACD.

Biological therapy

Dupilumab

Dupilumab, an inhibitor of the interleukin-4 receptor alpha (IL-4R α), has been approved for treating moderate-to-severe AD. Possibly, of all the molecules reviewed, dupilumab has the most published scientific evidence. As discussed in several articles, some allergens are immunomediated by Th2-type inflammation, which is why the use of dupilumab in ACD is being considered.³² A clinical trial is currently recruiting to evaluate the treatment of ACD (NCT03935971).³³ On the other hand, in the clinical trial evaluating the safety and efficacy profile of dupilumab vs placebo in patients with severe chronic hand eczema with inadequate response or intolerance to alitretinoin, 90% of patients on dupilumab showed allergic hypersensitivity to, at least, 1 substance with a 75% improvement in the Hand Eczema Severity Index (HECSI-75) on week 16 in 95% of patients on dupilumab vs 33% of patients on placebo.³⁴ The published therapeutic success of dupilumab in ACD increased interest in the use of this therapy in patients with relevant positive patch tests refractory to allergen avoidance.^{35–37} Isolated cases and case series of ACD patients patched with positive tests have been analyzed before and after dupilumab.³⁸ Allergens such as rubber,³⁹ sesquiterpene lactone mix,^{40,41} potassium dichromate,⁴² isobornyl acrylate (IBOA),⁴³ and even systemic contact dermatitis syndrome due to nickel sulfate and balsam of Peru were successfully treated with dupilumab.⁴⁴ A

national multicenter study showed that more than half of the patients patched before and after being on dupilumab showed false negatives.⁴⁵ In this regard, discontinuation of dupilumab treatment 2 weeks before patch testing should be considered, especially in those with frequent eczema flares and/or persistent localized dermatitis (such as the facial area). Due to the impact of occupational ACD and the sometimes difficult resolution of dermatitis, dupilumab has also been used successfully in 6 patients⁴⁶ or in cases of polysensitization in a hairdresser.⁴⁷ Although possibly controversial, dupilumab is an interesting option in patients sensitized to allergens whose immunogenic predisposition is of the Th2 type. Although they are likely valid treatments for ACD, there are no publications on tralokinumab, nemolizumab, or lebrikizumab to date. Table 3 illustrates the main studies on dupilumab and the treatment of ACD.

Secukinumab

Secukinumab is a fully human IgG1 kappa monoclonal antibody directed against IL-17.⁴⁸ IL-17 levels were elevated in mice and human subjects who showed a positive patch test reaction to nickel. These higher levels of IL-17 in these subjects indicate the involvement of IL-17 in the manifestation of ACD.^{14,49} Based on this finding, secukinumab was tested in ACD. However, in clinical practice, secukinumab therapy did not show any substantial clinical improvement.⁵⁰

Ustekinumab

Ustekinumab is a human IgG1k monoclonal antibody that blocks the biological activity of IL-12 and IL-23 by inhibiting the receptors for these cytokines on T cells, NK cells, and antigen-presenting cells, cytokines relevant for Th1 differentiation.⁵¹ The probable role of IL-23 in ACD has recently been highlighted.⁵² When ustekinumab was administered to 5 patients with recalcitrant ACD, only 1 patient showed clinical improvement.⁵³ In our opinion, the future commercialization of biosimilar ustekinumab may represent an interesting therapeutic option in patients sensitized to allergens whose predominant immunogenic pathway is Th1, where IL-12 plays a crucial role in the differentiation of naive T lymphocytes to Th1.

Omalizumab

Omalizumab is a monoclonal antibody directed against IgE, approved for the treatment of chronic urticaria and severe allergic asthma. Regarding its off-label use, cases of AD, bullous pemphigoid, Kimura's disease, and hyper-IgE syndrome with good response have been published.⁵⁴ Due to its mechanism of action, it does not interfere with the result of patch tests. In patients suffering from protein contact dermatitis mediated by IgE (type I hypersensitivity), omalizumab could be an interesting therapeutic option, especially in occupational cases. There is a publication of a case of recalcitrant occupational dermatitis associated with allergic asthma due to wheat exposure. Omalizumab 225 mg every 2 weeks was effective in controlling ACD without allergen avoidance.⁵⁵ The favorable response to treatment may be due to the combined type I and IV hypersensitivity mechanism, which opens a therapeutic window of opportunity for ACD due to proteins. We have experience in treating patients with

Table 3 Dupilumab. ACD with sensitization to relevant present allergen treatable, study type, response, and reference.

Allergen treated	Study type	Response	Reference
Rubber/latex	Case report (<i>N</i> = 1)	CR	39
Sesquiterpene lactone mix (<i>Compositae</i> plant species)	Case series (<i>N</i> = 2) ⁴⁰	CR	40,41
	Case report (<i>N</i> = 1) ⁴¹		
Sesquiterpene lactone mix (<i>Compositae</i> plant species)	Case report (<i>N</i> = 1)	CR	41
Potassium dichromate	Case report (<i>N</i> = 1)	CR	42
Isobornyl acrylate (IBOA)	Case report (<i>N</i> = 1)	CR	43
Nickel sulfate and balsam of Peru (systemic contact dermatitis syndrome)	Case series (<i>N</i> = 5)	CR	44
Occupational: irritant contact dermatitis, unknown ingredient in iced coffee powder, paraphenylenediamine, acrylates (airborne)	Case series (<i>N</i> = 6)	CR	46
Multiple allergens in hairdresser: paraphenylenediamine, glyceryl monothioglycolate, ammonium persulfate, tixocortol-21-pivalate, quaternium-15, formaldehyde, fragrance mix	Case report (<i>N</i> = 1)	PR	47

ACD: allergic contact dermatitis; CR: complete response; PR: partial response.

innate intolerance to fragrances in general, without showing positive sensitization during patch tests, with significant improvement of symptoms and improved these patients' quality of life.

Tumor necrosis factor- α inhibitors (anti-TNF α): infliximab, adalimumab, etanercept, and certolizumab pegol

TNF- α contributes to the development of ACD through various mechanisms. During sensitization, it promotes the activation and migration of antigen-presenting cells, facilitating allergen presentation to T cells. In the elicitation phase, it stimulates the release of pro-inflammatory cytokines and chemokines, resulting in increased infiltration of inflammatory cells and amplification of the inflammatory response.¹⁵ However, the use of anti-TNF α has proven insufficient in blocking ACD, suggesting that other pathways are involved that would act in compensation. Most studies in patients on biological therapy with these drugs do not show negativization of patch tests.^{56,57} On the other hand, subcutaneous injection of the drug can induce histopathological changes similar to a contact hypersensitivity reaction, such as local proliferation of fibroblasts and capillaries in the dermis, hyperplastic reaction of keratinocytes, or massive necrosis in the epidermis.⁵⁸

Only 1 case is available of a 30-year-old man with a personal history of atopy and sensitization to nickel sulfate and potassium dichromate with a good response to infliximab,⁵⁹ demonstrating efficacy in reducing the extent of lesions and associated pruritus with good tolerance to treatment; however, this article was published in 2006, prior to the commercialization of new therapies in AD.⁵⁹

Discussion

ACD is a complex disease whose pathophysiology involves the activation of the immune system mediated by T cells in

response to specific allergens.¹² Allergen avoidance, which is often not possible, and traditional treatments, such as topical corticosteroids and calcineurin inhibitors or classic immunosuppressants, have shown efficacy in many cases but have limitations in terms of side effects and incomplete response in some patients.¹⁵

JAKi is a promising emerging therapy due to their ability to modulate multiple inflammatory pathways simultaneously. This mechanism is particularly relevant in patients polysensitized to multiple allergens, where TH1, TH2, and TH17 pathways may be involved. The reviewed cases show a significant reduction in ACD symptoms, with a favorable short-term safety profile.^{21–23} Furthermore, the JAKi used in these patients have been administered at the lowest commercially available doses, including our experience with a patient on baricitinib 2 mg daily, which is interesting from a cost-effectiveness perspective.^{21,22} Despite this, the small number of patients and the short-term follow-up limit the generalization of these findings.

Apremilast could be a promising therapeutic option; however, there is only 1 clinical trial demonstrating efficacy in a limited number of patients.²⁵

Comparatively, biological therapies, such as IL-4/IL-13 inhibitors, also show encouraging results in the management of refractory ACD.^{39–44,46,47} However, in real clinical practice, there are fewer reports of successful cases with anti-IL-17 and anti-IL-23 biological drugs, despite their potential utility in ACD.^{50,53} Knowledge of the molecular signatures of allergens is essential for the choice of treatment according to the inflammatory pathway they activate^{13,14}; for this reason, the response of ACD patients to these treatments varies.

The mechanism of inhibition of the OX40/OX40L pathway could be particularly interesting in preventing the development of ACD due to its crucial role in the regulation of the adaptive immune response, specifically in the activation and proliferation of T cells.⁶⁰ This therapeutic target is currently being investigated for the treatment of AD.⁶¹ It will be

interesting to know the preventive role of these molecules in the development of ACD in these patients.

Personalizing treatment based on the patient's immunological profile could optimize therapeutic outcomes. In patients with comorbidities such as atopy, alopecia areata, psoriasis, or hidradenitis, or in those polysensitized where allergen avoidance is not possible, JAKi could offer a valuable therapeutic option.^{21–23}

Limitations

This article presents some limitations that must be acknowledged. The present review is limited by its narrative nature and is not a systematic review or meta-analysis. Most of the included studies are relatively recent case reports or case series and lack long-term safety and efficacy data; furthermore, in some patients, AD and ACD coexist.

In addition, the variability in patient response to treatments may complicate the generalization of the findings. The lack of direct comparative studies between the different emerging therapeutic options and conventional treatments is a significant limitation. Finally, more research is needed to identify biomarkers that can predict treatment response and guide the personalization of ACD management.

Conclusions

Emerging therapies for ACD, such as JAKi and biological therapies, show great potential to improve the management of this refractory condition. However, more data are needed to establish their place in routine clinical practice. JAKi, by acting more broadly by inhibiting multiple cytokines, would be the most promising drugs regarding efficacy; on the other hand, dupilumab would be a therapeutic option in those patients in whom atopic dermatitis and sensitization to allergens with predominantly Th2 polarization of the inflammatory response coexist. Personalizing treatment, based on the immunological profile and the identification of predictive biomarkers, is a promising area of research that could optimize clinical outcomes and improve the patients' quality of life.

Conflicts of interest

None declared.

References

- Elmas ÖF, Akdeniz N, Atasoy M, Karadag AS. Contact dermatitis: a great imitator. *Clin Dermatol*. 2020;38:176–92.
- Statescu L, Branisteanu D, Dobrescu C, Solovastu LG, Vasilca A, Petrescu Z, et al. Contact dermatitis – epidemiological study. *Maedica (Bucur)*. 2011;6:277–81.
- Hollins LC, Flamm A. Occupational contact dermatitis: evaluation and management considerations. *Dermatol Clin*. 2020;38:329–38.
- Rozas-Muñoz E, Gamé D, Serra-Baldrich E. Dermatitis de contacto alérgica por regiones anatómicas. Claves diagnósticas. *Actas Dermosifiliogr*. 2018;109:485–507.
- Alinaghi F, Bennike NH, Egeberg A, Thyssen JP, Johansen JD. Prevalence of contact allergy in the general population: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Contact Dermatitis*. 2019;80:77–85, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cod.13119>.
- Rubins A, Romanova A, Septe M, Maddukuri S, Schwartz RA, Rubins S. Contact dermatitis: etiologies of the allergic and irritant type. *Acta Dermatovenerol Alp Pannonica Adriat*. 2020;25:181–4.
- Tous-Romero F, Ortiz Romero PL, De Frutos JO. Usefulness of patch testing with patient's own products in the diagnosis of allergic contact dermatitis. *Dermatitis*. 2021;32:38–41.
- Bhatia J, Sarin A, Wollina U, Lotti T, Navarini AA, Mueller SM, et al. Review of biologics in allergic contact dermatitis. *Contact Dermatitis*. 2020;83:179–81, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cod.13584>.
- Mufti A, Lu JD, Sachdeva M, Zaaroura H, Kashetsky N, Yeung J, et al. Patch testing during immunosuppressive therapy: a systematic review. *Dermatitis*. 2021;32:365–74, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/DER.0000000000000726>.
- Loman L, Uter W, Armario-Hita JC, Ayala F, Balato A, Ballmer-Weber BK, et al. European Surveillance System on Contact Allergies (ESSCA): characteristics of patients patch tested and diagnosed with irritant contact dermatitis. *Contact Dermatitis*. 2021;85:186–97, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cod.13833>.
- Tramontana M, Hansel K, Bianchi L, Sensini C, Malatesta N, Stingoni L. Advancing the understanding of allergic contact dermatitis: from pathophysiology to novel therapeutic approaches. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2023;10, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/FMED.2023.1184289>.
- Nassau S, Fonacier L. Allergic contact dermatitis. *Med Clin North Am*. 2020;104:61–76.
- Lefevre MA, Nosbaum A, Rozieres A, Lenief V, Mosnier A, Cortial A, et al. Unique molecular signatures typify skin inflammation induced by chemical allergens and irritants. *Allergy*. 2021;76:3697–712, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/all.14989>.
- Dhingra N, Shemer A, Correa Da Rosa J, Rozenblit M, Fuentes-Duculan J, Gittler JK, et al. Molecular profiling of contact dermatitis skin identifies allergen-dependent differences in immune response. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2014;134:362–72, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2014.03.009>.
- Sung CT, McGowan MA, Machler BC, Jacob SE. Systemic treatments for allergic contact dermatitis. *Dermatitis*. 2019;30:46–53.
- Virtanen T, Haikarainen A, Raivola T, Silvennoinen JO. Selective JAKinibs: prospects in inflammatory and autoimmune diseases. *BioDrugs*. 2019;33:15–32.
- García-Melendo C, Cubiró X, Puig L. Inhibidores de JAK: usos en dermatología. Parte 1: generalidades, aplicaciones en vitiligo y en alopecia areata. *Actas Dermosifiliogr*. 2021;112:503–15.
- García-Melendo C, Cubiró X, Puig L. Inhibidores de JAK: usos en dermatología. Parte 2: aplicaciones en psoriasis, dermatitis atópica y otras dermatosis. *Actas Dermosifiliogr*. 2021;112:586–600.
- Johnson H, Guenther J, Adler BL, Yu JD. Janus kinase inhibitors: a promising therapeutic option for allergic contact dermatitis. *Cutis*. 2023;111, <http://dx.doi.org/10.12788/CUTIS.0705>.
- Amano W, Nakajima S, Yamamoto Y, Tanimoto A, Matsushita M, Miyachi Y, et al. JAK inhibitor JTE-052 regulates contact hypersensitivity by downmodulating T cell activation and differentiation. *J Dermatol Sci*. 2016;84:258–65, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jdermsci.2016.09.007>.
- Baltazar D, Shinamoto SR, Hamann CP, Hamann D, Hamann CR. Occupational airborne allergic contact dermatitis to invasive *Compositae* species treated with abrocitinib: a case report. *Contact Dermatitis*. 2022;87:542–4, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cod.14204>.
- Muddebihal K, Sardana K, Sinha S, Kumar D. Tofacitinib in refractory *Parthenium*-induced airborne allergic contact dermatitis. *Contact Dermatitis*. 2023;88:150–2.

23. Ch'en PY, Al-Saedy M, Song EJ. Upadacitinib as a treatment for co-existent allergic contact dermatitis and psoriasis. *JAAD Case Rep.* 2023;44:20–2.
24. Mainville L, Veillette H, Houle MC. Sequential patch testing in a patient treated with dupilumab then with upadacitinib: differences in patch test results as well as in disease control. *Contact Dermatitis.* 2023;88:402–4.
25. Volf EM, Au SC, Dumont N, Scheinman P, Gottlieb AB. A phase 2, open-label, investigator-initiated study to evaluate the safety and efficacy of apremilast in subjects with recalcitrant allergic contact or atopic dermatitis. *J Drugs Dermatol.* 2012;11:341–6.
26. Mansilla-Polo M, Gimeno E, Morgado-Carrasco D. Roflumilast tópico y oral en dermatología Una revisión narrativa. *Actas Dermosifiliogr.* 2024;115:265–79.
27. Gooderham M, Kircik L, Zirwas M, Lee M, Kempers S, Drae-los Z, et al. The safety and efficacy of roflumilast cream 0.15% and 0.05% in patients with atopic dermatitis: randomized, double-blind phase 2 proof of concept study. *J Drugs Dermatol.* 2023;22:139–47, <http://dx.doi.org/10.36849/JDD.7295>.
28. AstraZeneca. A phase 2a, 15-day, randomized, parallel group, double-blind, multi-centre, vehicle controlled trial to assess the efficacy and local safety of a cream containing 0.5% roflumilast – a phosphodiesterase type 4 inhibitor (PDE4i) dermal formulation – on atopic dermatitis patients with skin lesions of moderate severity. *clinicaltrials.gov*; 2016.
29. Kimyon RS, Schlarbaum JP, Liou YL, Hylwa SA, Warshaw EM. Allergic contact dermatitis to crisaborole. *Dermatitis.* 2019;30:272–4, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/DER.0000000000000488>.
30. Arora P, Neeley A. Contact allergy to crisaborole in a paediatric patient with atopic dermatitis. *Contact Dermatitis.* 2023;89:309–10.
31. Freitas E, Torres T. Difamilast for the treatment of atopic dermatitis. *J Int Med Res.* 2023;51, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/03000605231169445>.
32. Ludwig CM, Krase JM, Shi VY. T helper 2 inhibitors in allergic contact dermatitis. *Dermatitis.* 2021;32:15–8.
33. The effects of dupilumab on allergic contact dermatitis. *ClinicalTrials.gov* ID NCT03935971.
34. Voorberg AN, Kamphuis E, Christoffers WA, Schuttelaar MLA. Efficacy and safety of dupilumab in patients with severe chronic hand eczema with inadequate response or intolerance to alitretinoin: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase IIb proof-of-concept study. *Br J Dermatol.* 2023;189:400–9.
35. Jo CE, Mufti A, Sachdeva M, Pratt M, Yeung J. Effect of dupilumab on allergic contact dermatitis and patch testing. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2021;84:1772–6, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2021.02.044>.
36. Kuzyk A, Devani AR, Prajapati VH, Lio PA. Patch testing on dupilumab: reliable or not? *Cutis.* 2022;109:158–9.
37. Johnson H, Adler BL, Yu JD. Dupilumab for allergic contact dermatitis: an overview of its use and impact on patch testing. *Cutis.* 2022;109:265–7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.12788/CUTIS.0519>.
38. Bocquel S, Soria A, Raison-Peyron N, Badaoui A, Marcant P, Bara C, et al. Impact of dupilumab on patch test results and allergic contact dermatitis: a prospective multicenter study. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2024;90:512–20, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2023.10.029>.
39. Koh YG, Park JW, Shin SH, Kim BJ, Yoo KH. Dupilumab for the treatment of refractory allergic contact dermatitis from rubber/latex concomitant with atopic dermatitis. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol.* 2022;36:e640–3, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jdv.18099>.
40. Ruge IF, Skov L, Zachariae C, Thyssen JP. Dupilumab treatment in two patients with severe allergic contact dermatitis caused by sesquiterpene lactones. *Contact Dermatitis.* 2020;83:137–9.
41. Gallo R, Trave I, Castelli R, Gasparini G, Parodi A. Follow-up of patch test reactivity to sesquiterpene lactone mix in a patient successfully treated with dupilumab for severe airborne allergic contact dermatitis. *Contact Dermatitis.* 2023;89:140–1, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cod.14367>.
42. Wilson BN, Balogh EA, Rayhan DJ, Shitabata P, Yousefzadeh D, Feldman S. Chromate-induced allergic contact dermatitis treated with dupilumab. *J Drugs Dermatol.* 2021;20:1340–2, <http://dx.doi.org/10.36849/jdd.6246>.
43. Arasu A, Ross G. Treatment of generalised isobornyl acrylate contact allergy from diabetes pump with dupilumab. *Australas J Dermatol.* 2022;63:e91–3.
44. Jacob SE, Sung CT, Machler BC. Dupilumab for systemic allergy syndrome with dermatitis. *Dermatitis.* 2019;30:164–7.
45. Docampo-Simón A, Sánchez-Pujol MJ, Pastor-Nieto MA, Giménez-Arnau A, Rodríguez-Serna M, Serra-Baldrich E, et al. Patch testing in patients with severe atopic dermatitis treated with dupilumab: a multicentric approach in Spain. *Dermatitis.* 2023;34:315–22, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/derm.2022.0023>.
46. Slodownik D, Levi A, Lapidot M, Moshe S. Occupational chronic contact dermatitis successfully treated with dupilumab: a case series. *Dermatology.* 2022;238:1073–5.
47. Koblinski JE, Hamann D. Mixed occupational and iatrogenic allergic contact dermatitis in a hairdresser. *Occup Med (Lond).* 2020;70:523–6.
48. Patel DD, Lee DM, Kolbinger F, Antoni C. Effect of IL-17A blockade with secukinumab in autoimmune diseases. *Ann Rheum Dis.* 2013;72 Suppl. 2, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/ANNRHEUMDIS-2012-202371>.
49. Dyring-Andersen B, Skov L, Løvendør MB, Bzorek M, Søndergaard K, Lauritsen JP, et al. CD4(+) T cells producing interleukin (IL)-17, IL-22 and interferon- γ are major effector T cells in nickel allergy. *Contact Dermatitis.* 2013;68:339–47, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cod.12043>.
50. Todberg T, Zachariae C, Krustup D, Skov L. The effect of treatment with anti-interleukin-17 in patients with allergic contact dermatitis. *Contact Dermatitis.* 2018;78:431–2.
51. Benson JM, Peritt D, Scallon BJ, Heavner GA, Shealy DJ, Giles-Komar JM, et al. Discovery and mechanism of ustekinumab: a human monoclonal antibody targeting interleukin-12 and interleukin-23 for treatment of immune-mediated disorders. *MAbs.* 2011;3:535–45, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4161/MABS.3.6.17815>.
52. Pennino D, Eyerich K, Scarponi C, Carbone T, Eyerich S, Nasorri F, et al. IL-17 amplifies human contact hypersensitivity by licensing hapten nonspecific Th1 cells to kill autologous keratinocytes. *J Immunol.* 2010;184:4880–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4049/jimmunol.0901767>.
53. Bangsgaard N, Zachariae C, Menné T, Skov L. Lack of effect of ustekinumab in treatment of allergic contact dermatitis. *Contact Dermatitis.* 2011;65:227–30.
54. El-Qutob D. Off-label uses of omalizumab. *Clin Rev Allergy Immunol.* 2016;50:84–96.
55. Mur Gimeno P, Martín Iglesias A, Lombardero Vega M, Bautista Martínez P, Ventura López P. Occupational wheat contact dermatitis and treatment with omalizumab. *J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol.* 2013;23:287–8.
56. Rosmarin D, Bush M, Scheinman PL. Patch testing a patient with allergic contact hand dermatitis who is taking infliximab. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2008;59:145–7.
57. Kim N, Notik S, Gottlieb AB, Scheinman PL. Patch test results in psoriasis patients on biologics. *Dermatitis.* 2014;25:182–90.

58. Piguet PF, Grau GE, Vassalli P. Subcutaneous perfusion of tumor necrosis factor induces local proliferation of fibroblasts, capillaries, and epidermal cells, or massive tissue necrosis. *Am J Pathol.* 1990;136:103–10.
59. Cassano N, Loconsole F, Coviello C, Vena GA. Infliximab in recalcitrant severe atopic eczema associated with contact allergy. *Int J Immunopathol Pharmacol.* 2006;19:237–40.
60. Sato T, Ishii N, Murata K, Kikuchi K, Nakagawa S, Ndhlovu LC, et al. Consequences of OX40–OX40 ligand interactions in Langerhans cell function: enhanced contact hypersensitivity responses in OX40L-transgenic mice. *Eur J Immunol.* 2002;32:3326–35, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1521-4141\(200211\)32:11<3326::AID-IMMU3326>3.0.CO;2-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1521-4141(200211)32:11<3326::AID-IMMU3326>3.0.CO;2-9).
61. Croft M, Esfandiari E, Chong C, Hsu H, Kabashima K, Kricorian G, et al. OX40 in the pathogenesis of atopic dermatitis – a new therapeutic target. *Am J Clin Dermatol.* 2024;25:447–61, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40257-023-00838-9>.