

- 4 Grandolfo M, Romita P, Bonamonte D. Drug reaction with eosinophilia and systemic symptoms syndrome to hydroxychloroquine, an old drug in the spotlight in the COVID-19 era. *Dermatol Ther* 2020; <https://doi.org/10.1111/dth.13499>. Online ahead of print.
- 5 Girijala RL, Siddiqi I, Kwak Y *et al*. Pustular DRESS syndrome secondary to hydroxychloroquine with EBV reactivation. *J Drugs Dermatol* 2019; **18**: 207–209.
- 6 Schmutz J-L, Trechot P. DRESS associated with azithromycin in a child. *Ann Dermatol Venereol* 2013; **140**: 75.
- 7 Sriratanaviriyakul N, Nguyen L-P, Henderson MC, Albertson TE. Drug reaction with eosinophilia and systemic symptoms syndrome (DRESS) syndrome associated with azithromycin presenting like septic shock: a case report. *J Med Case Rep* 2014; **8**: 332.
- 8 Bauer KA, Brimhall AK, Chang TT. Drug reaction with eosinophilia and systemic symptoms (DRESS) associated with azithromycin in acute Epstein-Barr virus infection. *Pediatr Dermatol* 2011; **28**: 741–743.
- 9 Girijala RL, Ramamurthi A, Wright D, Kwak Y, Goldberg LH. DRESS syndrome associated with influenza virus. *Proc (Bayl Univ Med Cent)* 2019; **32**: 277–278.

DOI: 10.1111/jdv.16838

Management of biological therapies for chronic plaque psoriasis during COVID-19 emergency in Italy

Dear Editor,

The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection, is creating an unprecedented global public health emergency with the continuous growth of infected individuals worldwide.¹ Italy was one of the first European countries to face the first wave of infection outside mainland China.² The first case of COVID-

19 was confirmed in Lombardy on 20 February 2020, and subsequently, a rapid increase in the number of detected cases was observed, spreading through Italy and the rest of Europe.³ As of 22 April, confirmed COVID-19 cases in Italy were 183 957.^{2,4}

Because of the impaired immunologic status of patients with psoriasis, their clinical management is challenging in the pandemic, particularly for those using biologics inhibiting key pathogenic cytokines such as TNF- α , IL-17, IL-12/23 or IL-23.^{5–6}

To date, there is neither an agreement nor a study sustaining the impact of continuing or stopping biologics in psoriatic patients during the COVID-19 pandemic.^{7–10}

The PSO-BIO-COVID is an observational, multicentric study, supported by the Italian Society of Dermatology (SIDEMaST), aimed at evaluate the impact of SARS-CoV-2 infection on the management of patients with psoriasis in Italy, during the first year of the pandemic.

Patients with moderate-to-severe chronic plaque psoriasis, aged >18 years, undergoing treatment with any biological agent as of 22 February 2020, were eligible.

Data on biological agent used for treatment and any suspension and/or lengthening of time intervals (LTIs) for treatment administration between 22 February and 22 April 2020 have been collected in a standardized data collection system through face-to-face, remote visits or via email. Frequency and percentages on the total number of centres and patients were the analyses performed.

The study was approved by the National Ethical Committee for COVID-19-related studies at INMI Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, with the Dermatology Unit-Fondazione Policlinico Tor Vergata as the coordinating centre.

A total of 12 807 psoriatic patients from 33 specialized dermatologic centres were included in the study. 328 patients (2.6%) stopped treatment during the observation period without consulting their dermatologist mainly because of fearing high contagious risk; 233 (1.8%) interrupted their therapy after

Table 1 Number and percentage of psoriatic patients treated with a biological agent in Italy. Period: 22 February 2020–22 April 2020

	ADA	ETA	INF	UST	SEC	IXE	BRO	GUS	TIL	RIS	Total
Total patients	3045	1645	343	2638	2417	1586	297	628	16	192	12 807
Mean % of treated patients for each biological drugs	23.8%	12.8%	2.7%	20.6%	18.9%	12.4%	2.3%	4.9%	0.1%	1.5%	100%
Patients stopping therapy autonomously†	90 (3.0%)	49 (3.0%)	19 (5.5%)	72 (2.7%)	49 (2.0%)	32 (2.0%)	5 (1.7%)	9 (1.4%)	0	3 (1.6%)	328 (2.6%)
Patients stopping therapy after consulting with the physician†	85 (2.8%)	30 (1.8%)	10 (2.9%)	21 (0.8%)	36 (1.5%)	8 (0.5%)	5 (1.7%)	13 (2.1%)	0	4 (2.1%)	233 (1.8%)
Patients' LTIs of therapy autonomously†	47 (1.5%)	61 (3.7%)	5 (1.5%)	28 (1.1%)	27 (1.1%)	9 (0.6%)	2 (0.7%)	4 (0.6%)	0	2 (1.0%)	185 (1.4%)
Patients' LTIs of therapy after consulting with the physician†	25 (0.8%)	6 (0.4%)	11 (3.2%)	26 (1.0%)	10 (0.4%)	26 (1.6%)	1 (0.3%)	5 (0.8%)	0	4 (2.1%)	114 (0.9%)

ADA, adalimumab; BRO, brodalumab; ETA, etanercept; GUS, guselkumab; INF, infliximab; IXE, ixekizumab; LTIs, lengthening of time intervals; RIS, risankizumab; SEC, secukinumab; TIL, tildrakizumab; UST, ustekinumab.

†Percentages are calculated on the total number of patients.

consulting their dermatologist mainly because of suspected infection or contact with the SARS-CoV-2 as they were professional healthcare providers or they have had a contact with SARS-CoV-2+ subjects (Table 1). Discontinuation rates ranged from 1.4% for patients using guselkumab to 5.5% for those treated with infliximab, when the decision was taken by the patients, while ranged between 0.5% for ixekizumab-treated patients and 2.8% for adalimumab-treated when the decision was taken after dermatological consultation.

An additional 185 (1.4%) patients have autonomous LTIs of their therapy, and further 114 (0.9%) did the same but after consulting their reference centre. The risk and fear of the contagious were the most frequently reported reasons for LTIs the treatment.

This observational study included patients across Italy having a large variability of SARS-CoV-2 infection incidence. Centres were highly representative of the Italian distribution of SARS-CoV-2 during the observation period, ranging from cities like Bergamo or Milan, in Lombardy, having more than 20,000 confirmed diagnoses of COVID-19, to Cagliari (Sardinia) and Palermo (Sicily) where less than 500 cases were observed in the period when this observation was performed.⁴

The low number of patients who have interrupted treatment or have LTIs for their treatment at the peak of the infection seems a clear signal that neither the patient nor their reference physician felt this as an option ensuring a satisfactory balance between the risks and potential benefits.

This outcome highlights the importance of a continuous and trusting relationship between the patient and the medical staff who is taking care of his/her psoriasis. Patients and dermatologists are satisfied using biologics for psoriasis treatment. Thus, both are reluctant to interrupt biological therapy if no contraindications occurred.

Further details on the incidence of COVID-19 disease in patients with chronic plaque psoriasis treated with biological agents, clinical course and outcomes of patients who developed SARS-CoV-2 infection or who have been exposed to someone with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 will be obtained by the ongoing investigation by the PSO-BIO-COVID study group.

Conflicts of interest

L. Bianchi reports personal fees from speaker and as consultant for AbbVie, Novartis, Janssen-Cilag, Pfizer, UCB and Leo Pharma, outside the submitted work. SP Cannavò has served as speaker or board member for AbbVie, Celgene, Eli Lilly, Leo Pharma, Janssen, Novartis and Sanofi Genzyme. A. Chiricozzi served as advisory board member and consultant and has received fees and speaker's honoraria or has participated in clinical trials for AbbVie, Ammirall, Biogen, Fresenius Kabi, Leo Pharma, Lilly, Janssen, Novartis, Sanofi Genzyme and UCB Pharma. A. Conti served as advisory board member and consultant, and has received fees and speaker's honoraria or has participated in clinical trials for AbbVie, Leo Pharma, Eli Lilly,

Novartis, UCB Pharma, Pfizer, Sandoz, Celgene, Biogen and Janssen-Cilag. M.C. Fagnoli has served on advisory boards, received honoraria for lectures and research grants from Ammirall, AbbVie, Galderma, Leo Pharma, Mylan, Medac Pharma, Celgene, Pierre Fabre, UCB, Eli Lilly, Pfizer, Janssen, Novartis, Sanofi Genzyme, Roche, Sun Pharma and MSD. P. Gisondi has been a consultant and/or speaker for AbbVie, Ammirall, Celgene, Janssen, Leo Pharma, Eli Lilly, Novartis, Pfizer, Sandoz and UCB. K. Peris reports personal fees for advisory board meeting from Ammirall, AbbVie, Biogen, Janssen, Eli Lilly, Celgene, Galderma, Leo Pharma, Novartis, Pierre Fabre, Sanofi, Sandoz and Sun Pharma outside the conduct of the work. I. Zalaudek has been a consultant and/or speaker for Novartis, Celgene and Amgen.

Funding sources

No funding sources.

M. Talamonti,^{1,†} M. Galluzzo,^{1,†} A. Chiricozzi,^{2,3,†} P. Quaglino,⁴ G. Fabbrocini,⁵ P. Gisondi,⁶ A.V. Marzano,^{7,8} C. Potenza,⁹ A. Conti,¹⁰ A. Parodi,¹¹ A. Belloni Fortina,¹² F. Bardazzi,¹³ G. Argenziano,¹⁴ F. Rongioletti,¹⁵ L. Stingeni,¹⁶ G. Micali,¹⁷ F. Loconsole,¹⁸ M. Venturini,¹⁹ M.R. Bongiorno,²⁰ C. Feliciani,²¹ P. Rubegni,²² P. Amerio,²³ M.C. Fagnoli,²⁴ P. Pigatto,²⁵ P. Savoia,²⁶ S.P. Nisticò,²⁷ S. Giustini,²⁸ A. Carugno,²⁹ S.P. Cannavò,³⁰ G. Rech,³¹ F. Prignano,³² A. Offidani,³³ M. Lombardo,³⁴ I. Zalaudek,³⁵ L. Bianchi,^{1,‡} K. Peris,^{2,3,†,‡} PSO-BIO-COVID study group[¶]

¹Dermatology Department, University of Rome 'Tor Vergata', Rome, Italy,

²Dermatologia, Dipartimento Scienze Mediche e Chirurgiche, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli IRCCS, Rome, Italy, ³Dermatologia, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Rome, Italy, ⁴Medical Sciences

Department, Dermatologic Clinic, University of Turin, Turin, Italy,

⁵Section of Dermatology – Department of Clinical Medicine and Surgery, University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy, ⁶Section of Dermatology

and Venereology, Department of Medicine, University of Verona, Verona, Italy, ⁷Dermatology Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale

Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy, ⁸Department of Pathophysiology and Transplantation, Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italy, ⁹Department

of Medico-Surgical Sciences and Biotechnologies, Dermatology Unit 'Daniele Innocenzi' Sapienza University of Rome - Polo Pontino, Rome,

Italy, ¹⁰Dermatologic Unit, Department of Specialized Medicine, AOU Policlinico di Modena, Modena, Italy, ¹¹Ospedale-Policlinico San Martino

IRCCS Genova, Clinica Dermatologica DiSSal Università di Genova, Genova, Italy, ¹²Dermatology Unit – Department of Medicine DIMED,

University of Padova, Padova, Italy, ¹³Dermatology Division, Department of Experimental, Diagnostic and Specialty Medicine, University of Bologna,

Italy, ¹⁴Dermatology Unit, University of Campania Luigi Vanvitelli, Naples, Italy, ¹⁵Section of Dermatology, Department of Medical Sciences and

Public Health, University of Cagliari, Cagliari, Italy, ¹⁶Dermatology Section, Department of Medicine, University of Perugia, Perugia, Italy,

¹⁷Dermatology Clinic, University of Catania, Catania, Italy, ¹⁸Department of Biomedical Science and Human Oncology, Unit of Dermatology, University of Bari, Bari, Italy, ¹⁹Department of Dermatology, ASST Spedali

Civili of Brescia, University of Brescia, Brescia, Italy, ²⁰Section of Dermatology, Department of Health Promotion, Maternal-Infant, Internal Medicine and Specialization, University of Palermo, Palermo, Italy, ²¹Department of Medicine and Surgery, Section of Dermatology, University of Parma, Parma, Italy, ²²Dermatology Unit, Department of Medical, Surgical and Neurosciences, University of Siena, Italy, ²³Department of Medicine and Aging Science, Dermatologic Clinic, G. D'Annunzio University, Chieti, Italy, ²⁴Dermatology, Department of Biotechnological and Applied Clinical Sciences, University of L'Aquila, L'Aquila, Italy, ²⁵Department of Biomedical, Surgical and Dental Sciences, Clinical Dermatology, IRCCS Galeazzi Orthopaedic Institute, University of Milan, Milan, Italy, ²⁶Department of Health Science, Dermatologic Clinic, University of Eastern Piedmont, Novara, Italy, ²⁷Dermatology Unit, Department of Health Sciences, Università Magna Graecia, Catanzaro, Italy, ²⁸Department of Dermatology, Sapienza' University of Rome, Rome, Italy, ²⁹Dermatology Unit, ASST Papa Giovanni XXIII Hospital, Bergamo, Italy, ³⁰Dermatology, Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, University of Messina, Messina, Italy, ³¹Division of Dermatology, Santa Chiara Hospital, Trento, Italy, ³²Dermatology Clinic, Department of Health Sciences, University of Florence, Florence, Italy, ³³Dermatological Clinic, Department of Clinical and Molecular Sciences, Polytechnic University of the Marche Region, Ancona, Italy, ³⁴Unit of Dermatological Diseases, ASST Sette Laghi, Ospedale di Circolo, Varese, Italy, ³⁵Department of Dermatology, University of Trieste, Trieste, Italy

*Correspondence: K. Peris. E-mail: ketty.peris@unicatt.it

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

[‡]These authors are both senior authors.

[§]PSO-BIO-COVID study group members are in Appendix.

References

- Cao X. COVID-19: immunopathology and its implications for therapy. *Nat Rev Immunol* 2020; **20**: 269–270.
- COVID-19 situation reports. [WWW document]. URL <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports/> (last accessed 22 April 2020).
- Carugno A, Gambini DM, Raponi F *et al*. COVID-19 and biologics for psoriasis: a high-epidemic area experience - Bergamo, Lombardy, Italy. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2020; **83**: 292–294.
- COVID-19 integrated surveillance: key national data. [WWW document]. URL <https://www.epicentro.iss.it/en/coronavirus/sars-cov-2-integrated-surveillance-data>. (last accessed 8 May 2020).
- Amerio P, Prignano F, Giuliani F *et al*. COVID-19 and psoriasis: should we fear for patients treated with biologics? *Dermatol Ther* 2020; e13434. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dth.13434>
- Mahil SK, Yiu ZZN, Mason KJ *et al*. Global reporting of cases of COVID-19 in psoriasis and atopic dermatitis: an opportunity to inform care during a pandemic. *Br J Dermatol* 2020; **183**: 404–406. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjd.19161>
- Bardazzi F, Loi C, Sacchelli L *et al*. Biologic therapy for psoriasis during the covid-19 outbreak is not a choice. *J Dermatolog Treat* 2020; **31**: 320–321.
- Megna M, Ruggiero A, Marasca C *et al*. Biologics for psoriasis patients in the COVID-19 era: more evidence, less fears. *J Dermatolog Treat* 2020; **31**: 328–329.
- Gisoni P, Facheris P, Dapavo P *et al*. The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on patients with chronic plaque psoriasis being treated with biologic therapy: the Northern Italy experience. *Br J Dermatol* 2020; **183**: 373–374. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjd.19158>
- Lebwohl, M Rivera-Oyola, R Murrell, DF. Should biologics for psoriasis be interrupted in the era of COVID-19? *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2020; **82**: 1217–1218.

Appendix

R Balestri, N Bernardini, E Botti, M Burlando, G Caldarola, A Cattaneo, P Dapavo, S Dastoli, C De Simone, S Di Nuzzo, F Diotallevi, MT Fierro, R Fidanza, C Foti, DM Gambini, A Gambardella, G Girolomoni, C Guarneri, G Gualdi, K Hansel, M Megna, C Mugheddu, ML Musumeci, A Patrizi, G Pellacani, S Piaserico, AG Richetta, E Rosi, MT Rossi, L Sacchelli, R Tiberio, G Tilotta, E Trovato, R Vezzoni, A Zangrilli

[Correction added on 24 November 2020, after first online publication: In Appendix section, 'K Hansel' has been corrected in this version.]

DOI: 10.1111/jdv.16841

A survey on tele dermatology use and doctors' perception in times of COVID-19

Dear Editor

The COVID-19 outbreak represented a tipping point for telemedicine. Because of the need of social distancing imposed by healthcare authorities to prevent the spread of the disease, the demand for telehealth increased dramatically.^{1–3} We aimed to investigate tele dermatology (TD) use and doctors' perception during the recent pandemic. The TD task force of the EADV (European Academy of Dermatology and Venerology) ideated an online survey that was spread via email among dermatologists with the support of EADV, AIDNID (Italian Association of Non Invasive Imaging in Dermatology) and SIDE Mast (Italian Society of Dermatology and Venerology).

Four hundred and thirty-four doctors from 49 Countries completed the survey, 67.1% women. 35.5% were <40 years old; 24.0% were aged 40–50 years; 25.4% aged between 51–60 years; 15% were older than 60 years.

The majority of respondents were board-certified dermatologists (87.1%); working in public hospital/ambulatory/clinic in 29.5% of cases, in public University in 24.2%, in private hospital/clinic/ambulatory in 44.0% of cases and 2.3% working in a private University. The majority were from Southern Europe (210; 48.4%), followed by Northern Europe (88; 20.3%) and Eastern Europe (69; 15.9%); 35 (8.1%) were from Asia; 9 (2.1%) were from South America, 3 (0.7%) from Africa; 2 (0.5%) from Australia; 18 (4.0%) did not declare their origin.

54.1% ($n = 235$) of respondents declared to already practice TD before the pandemic, in the last 5 years on average (years of TD practice ranging from 1 to 20 years). Of these, 65.5% ($n = 154/235$) dermatologists declared to use TD not regularly