A case of contact dermatitis to dimethylfumarate in shoes identified in Italy
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INTRODUCTION

Dimethylfumarate (DMF) is the methyl ester of fumaric acid. It is a potent immune modulator, able to induce apoptosis in human T cells [1], suppress lymphokine and monokine secretion as well as alloreactive and mitogenic lymphoproliferative responses [2, 3]. DMF is considered to be the active compound within the commercial mixture used for oral therapy of severe psoriasis which was registered in 1994 in Germany under the brand name Fumaderm® and whose registration is now pending in many European countries [3]. DMF is not considered suitable for topical treatment due to its contact-urticarial and sensitizing properties [4]. More recently, oral treatments with DMF have been
suggested for patients affected by relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis as effective in reducing new inflammatory lesions [5]. Side effects related to oral therapy are usually transient and consist of flushing, nausea, stomach pains, diarrhoea, tiredness, transient eosinophilia and lymphocytopenia [4, 5].

DMF is also a biocide, able to inhibit mould growth [6]. However, its use for consumer products has been forbidden in the European Union since 1998 under the Biocide Directive 98/8/EC since able to cause irritating and sensitizing reactions in humans. Despite that protective measure, DMF has been recently identified as the causal factor of an epidemic of severe contact dermatitis occurred in Finland and in the UK in 2006-2007, related to sofas and armchairs manufactured in China [7, 8]. Some cases of shoe dermatitis from DMF had been also documented [9, 10]. The source of exposure was found to be DMF in little bags inserted on interior of furniture or in footwear boxes. It thus evaporated and impregnated the product material. Taking into account these observations, in 2009 the European Union decided to require Member States to ensure adequate measure to avoid that products containing DMF are imported into the Community and made available on the market [11]. In accordance with that Decision, the Italian Ministry of Health (IMH) requires that the importers of goods from outside European Countries certify the biocide used to avoid their spoilage and performs systematic controls in order to verify their composition. Furthermore, IMH requires that health services notify cases with a diagnosis of allergic dermatitis due to contact with materials contaminated with DMF (e.g., shoes, furniture, clothes, soft toys).

In the present report is a case of shoe dermatitis with documented exposure to DMF notified to IMH by the Poison Control Centre of Milan (PCCM) in 2009 is described.

**CASE REPORT**

On March 2009, a 35 year old woman, while wearing a new pair of shoes (brand name “Magie di fata”, imported from China) for a 8 hour period started to experience feet itching. On the following day, she suffered an increase in feet itching, pain and redness. She consulted a pharmacist who considered these reactions possibly related to fungal infection and prescribed a topical treatment with antifungal cream and an anti-inflammatory agent (ketoprofen). In the subsequent two days the woman did not wear the shoes. Nevertheless, she experienced feet blistering and swelling limited to the area which was in contact with the shoes vamp. She consulted a general practitioner who considered the observed lesions suggestive of contact dermatitis and prescribed topical application of cortisone. Two days after the beginning of the treatment, the patient developed bullous eczema and referred to a first aid service for medication (Figure 1). At hospital, the lesions were treated for a 15 day period with topical application of sulfadiazine and gentamicin. A course of oral antibiotic (amoxicillin) was also prescribed. Twenty days after the onset of symptoms, the patient was still suffering for the consequences of dermatitis, reporting skin redness, dryness, and pain. She refused to be patch tested and consulted the Poison Control Centre (PCC) of Milan in order to get information on possible shoe allergens. Considering recent reports [9, 10], a test for the presence of DMF in shoes materials was suggested. Following that indication, the shoes were sent to the National Institute of Health in order to be analysed. The analytical procedure was as follow: sample (1-5 g) from the shoes sole and vamp were extracted with 10 ml of acetonitrile in an ultrasonic warmed bath at 60 °C for 20 min. The extracted samples were filtered through 0.45 μm pore size Anotop (Millipore Corporation, Bedford USA) and preliminarily ana-
The case here reported refused to be patch tested but characterized by positive reaction with DMF at 0.001% [10]. Exposure to shoes were observed in Spain and characterized by sites affected by contact dermatitis. A higher concentration of DMF in the shoes identified a possible explanation for delimitation of vamp (595 mg/kg) in comparison to the sole (171 mg/kg), providing a possible explanation for delimitation of sites affected by contact dermatitis. The articles associated with contact dermatitis were promptly withdrawn from the national market. Surveillance activities, carried out in Europe according to Commission Decision 2009/251/EC[11], allowed identification of several footwear containing DMF, while reports on contaminated furniture or other articles were very limited [12]. The vast majority of the articles notified to RAPEX were available on the market at the moment they were identified. Occurrence of incidents related to DMF exposure was mentioned in some reports, indicating that surveillance of cases, especially those due to shoe contact, could provide a relevant support to market surveillance. Within this frame, a particular contribution to case identification is expected to be provided by dermatologists and consumer organizations. Nevertheless, the Italian case of shoe dermatitis here reported indicates that PCCs can also contribute to case identification, since they may be consulted to get information on possible allergens. Furthermore, PCCs could handle suspected cases of oral or dermal acute exposure to DMF found in anti-mould sachets, allowing rapid identification of goods escaping regular customs controls. With reference to this aspect, it is worth mentioning that in 2006-2009 the PCCM handled 8 symptomatic cases exposed to the content of sachets marked “mould-proof agent” (Davanzo, personal communication). One of them occurred in 2006 and 2008, respectively, two in 2007, and four in 2009. All cases were children aged less than 4 years who found the sachets in footwear boxes. Clinical effects reported shortly after contact and/or suspected oral ingestion were considered suggestive of exposure to DMF. They included: hives (n. 4), rush (n. 3), oral cavity hyperemia (n. 1), lip oedema (n. 1), vomiting (n. 1), and diarrhea (n. 1). Unfortunately, no samples of the sachets contents were available for chemical analyses.
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