

Clinical Application of Irritant Contact Dermatitis on Hands and Diagnosis of It

Fatimah Khalifah Mohammad Al Sulaiman^{1*} Maha Bahjat Almadani²

¹ Senior Pharmacist, At Prince Sultan Cardiac Center, KSA

² Senior Pharmacist, At Prince Sultan Military, Medical City

Abstract – Hand hygiene (HH) is the single most important procedure that can be followed by healthcare workers (HCWs) to reduce the risk of spreading healthcare-associated infections. The irritating contact dermatitis (ICD) that occurs due to the rehashed presentation of HH products and technique is one reason often referred to for resistance. In this study we concentrate on the irritating contact dermatitis on hands and it is also diagnosis.

Keywords: Dermatitis, ICD, HH products, HCWs

-----X-----

1. INTRODUCTION

Irritant contact dermatitis may be defined as a skin's non-allergic inflammatory reaction to an outside agent. The acute type consists of two forms, irritant reaction and acute irritant dermatitis of contact, and usually has only one cause. In contrast, cumulative insult dermatitis, the chronic form is in most cases a multifactorial disease. Toxic chemicals (irritants) are the primary driver though mechanical, warm and climatic impacts are important contributory cofactors. The clinical range of irritant contact dermatitis is a lot more extensive than unfavorably susceptible contact dermatitis, going from slight scaling of the stratum corneum to redness, whealing, and profound acidic consumes, to an eczematous condition that can't be recognized from hypersensitive contact dermatitis. Acute forms of irritant contact dermatitis can be painful and can be linked to sensations such as burning, stinging or itching. Individual sensitivity to irritants is highly variable.

Hand cleanliness (HH) is the most important absolute strategy that human service workers (HCWs) can pursue to reduce the risk of spreading related contamination in social insurance. This simple task, however, remains less than 50 per cent (1,2). One of the reasons frequently cited for noncompliance is irritant contact dermatitis (ICD) caused by the deleterious effects of repeated exposure to HH products and procedure (3).

Without disrupting normal practice in the clinical area, conducting a clinically realistic study is difficult. As a result, under typical clinical conditions, there are relatively few published accounts of different aspects

of hand skin condition among HCWs (4,5). Although there has been a significant increase in the number of published studies dealing with HH in recent years, many questions about HH products and strategies to improve compliance with recommended policies remain unanswered.

The ICD incidence has been well documented.

Boyce and Pittet (6) found that the history of skin issues was detailed by up to 85 per cent of medical caregivers and 25 per cent revealed side effects of dermatitis.

Lampel et al found that 55 percent of the hospitalized nurses and 65 percent of the intensive care unit (ICU) had hand dermatitis observed (7). Despite the fact that the pace of ICD was accounted for to be unaltered for the years going before an expansion in methicillin-safe Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA),(8) an ongoing report by the Institute of Population Health at the University of (Manchester, UK) found that out of 713 revealed instances of ICD, 1796 were in HCWs, in light of reports willfully put together by dermatologists somewhere in the range of 1996 and 2012(9). HCWs were 4.5 occasions bound to experience the ill effects of ICD in 2012, when the numbers were separated by year, as they were in 1996. This expansion was credited to a decrease in the drive toward MRSA.

2. IRRITANT VS. ALLERGIC CONTACT DERMATITIS

Except perhaps in the earliest cases, it is extraordinarily difficult to distinguish between irritant and allergic contact dermatitis without the aid of patch testing: sometimes a patient might even have a mixture of both. Allergic contact dermatitis is often the more severe and vesicular in its morphology although its severity can vary from day to day, making the diagnosis even more complicated. Irritating contact dermatitis is often less severe and less vesicular but can become as severe as any allergic contact dermatitis when well established.

Simple epidemiology can somewhat come to the rescue of a dermatologist. A contact allergen has to be very potent and highly unprotected against involving as many as a third of a workforce, whereas a chronic enough irritant often affects numbers approaching this proportion. Note that in every exposed person irritants rarely cause dermatitis: there is far too much variation in individual susceptibility for this.

Distant spread — e.g., the face involved, as well as the hands — is far more common in allergic than irritant contact dermatitis, with eyelid swelling being particularly characteristic of allergy. Relapses are more common in allergic dermatitis than in irritants within days or even hours of renewed exposure. Undulant or relapsing and remitting courses are probably more common in irritant than in allergic dermatitis, while exposure continues. On topical corticosteroids, however, both can respond equally well (or badly).

3. CLINICAL APPLICATION OF IRRITANT CONTACT DERMATITIS ON HANDS

The 3 sections are:

- Knowledge of skin function and ICD,
- Skills to monitor ICD on HCW's hands, and
- Guidelines, practices, and policies for HCWs to act on ICD-related issues.

3.1 Knowledge of Skin Function and ICD

This review component was conducted to give an overview of skin physiology. The skin serves numerous capacities including obstruction capacities (e.g. water disaster, irritant introduction, light) and contamination control, sensation, basic help, and warm guidance. The peripheral layer, known as the stratum corneum (SC), gives physical, mechanical, and immunological boundaries against natural abuse. The practical epidermis ceaselessly develops and reloads the boundary. The living cells discharge their substance to form lipid layers that collect fit

between the cells as a fiddle. Right now the cells "climb" from the lower layers, are discharged or shed from the skin surface through desquamation. The arrangement is painstakingly customized and coordinated through flagging instruments to frame a fantastically flimsy and solid structure that takes up after an exhibit of "block and cement." Exceedingly huge powers are needed to demolish its respectability. Langerhans (cells which introduce antigens) are located in the appropriate layer (epidermis). They are a piece of the insusceptible framework and they "shield" the life form if the SC hindrance is abused. The SC obstruction shields cells from direct natural introduction from the Langerhans and thus serves a fundamental capacity to control contamination.

3.2 Skills to Monitor ICD on HCWs' Hands

It is a test to check ICD during customary clinical practice without interfering with the typical HCW practices of assembling information. However, many sources do document if or how they monitored ICD for the study when studying the effects of HH products and procedure. Examples of objective reporting (independent assessor) and self-reporting (self-surveys and/or monitoring of Employee Health complaints) were found. In one examination, 52 medical caregivers were prepared to perform HH by washing only or using liquor scouring alone to review their own hands using the Larson Skin Assessment Rating Scale, which for this specific investigation did focus on skin appearance, trustworthiness, moisture and skin sensation (10).

3.3 Guidelines, practices, and policies for HCWs to act on ICD-related issues.

Pittet et al reported on a hospital-wide HH program which improved compliance with HH as monitored through observation, changes in the rates of infection associated with health care, and changes in product consumption. During the study, HCWs were encouraged repeatedly to consult the Employee Health Unit for any concerns associated with the use of HH products. No notable skin damage (extreme skin disturbance and dryness with fissuring or splitting, severe ICD, unfavorably susceptible or toxic responses) has been reported to the Employee Health Unit, despite the consistency expansion among some HCWs and the significant increase in hand scoring based on liquor. (This is an example of the monitoring and intervention of third-party traffic.)(10)

4. CURRENT GUIDELINES, PRACTICES, AND POLICIES

4.1 Guidelines

World Health Organization rules energize the use of salves and creams to treat side effects of ICD1;

they not only urge HCWs to advise manufacturers on effects and similarity with antimicrobial HH products, but also urge HCWs to consider the unfavorably susceptible reactions that may occur when using lotions. The National Guideline on Dermatitis in the health care workplace of the Royal College of Physicians (United Kingdom) discusses the roles and effectiveness of prework (barrier) creams, conditioning creams, and ICD-affected HH procedures. While their findings indicate that prework creams have a positive overall impact on the quality and function of HCW skin, the impact of conditioning creams is less proven and may even cause further hand irritation, and they note the need for further research in the clinical setting.

Murphy suggests 10 different self-study tests that an HCW can perform to determine the source of hand irritation in a monograph for continuing study for registered nurses. Steps include observing washing and drying techniques, checking environmental factors such as cleaners or laundry detergents, and even taking seasonal weather into consideration. The final step suggests that if there is still no reasonable case history, the HCW should be referred to its own doctor or occupational health for assessment.(11) The Just Clean Your H is managed by Public Health Ontario (Canada), a public health agency dedicated to protecting and promoting the health of all Ontarians by applying and advancing science and knowledge. Included is a fact sheet and evaluation questionnaire for HH-associated skin problems. The tool may be used to devise a strategy for avoiding irritating practices or products (12).

4.2 Practice:

Rocha et al compared the microbial flora of healthy handed nurses (n= 30) to hands-damaged nurses with frequent HH or wearing gloves (n= 30). Harmed hands had higher count of microscopic organisms. The creators suggest that since bothering caused on the skin by visit washing as well as wearing of gloves is related with changes close by microbial verdure, their latent capacity dangers ought to be viewed as when establishments/clients are choosing products/definitions to guarantee hand skin wellbeing and ensuing consistence with their own cleanliness strategies (13) McGuckin et al dealt with a HH item use checking program and noticed a drop in sanitizer use toward the start of the new year/January-February season. Catch up with individuals in the program uncovered that HCWs were bringing their very own sanitizers and salves to work. For reasons such as home products having a desirable scent or because portability of the product allowed ease of use, products given to them during the holidays were preferred over hospital-provided products. Detailed monitoring of product use will reveal the habits of HCWs which may need to be addressed in order to best comply with professional product use directives (14).

4.3 Policies:

Directive of the Department of Veterans Affairs (US): "Appropriate hand lotions or creams have to be readily available to minimize irritant contact dermatitis. NOTE: Products proposed for applications for human services that do not reduce the adequacy of other hand-cleaning products, such as antimicrobial mixtures such as chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG), should be given. A few salves are explicitly promoted as 'CHG agreeable.' Hand moisturizers or creams have to be good at the office with the gloves used. "(15) HH policy at the University of Texas Medical Branch:" Bottles and other large hand lotion containers may become contaminated with pathogenic organisms. So only small disposable bottles or lotion packets are to be used. Unfavorably susceptible reactions to skin-applied products can occur as replaced type responses, or less generally as quick reactions. If an HCW suspects hypersensitive contact dermatitis, they will be told to go to the Employee Health Center and complete a documentation structure for Hand Dermatitis (see appendix). The HCW will be surveyed by worker wellbeing doctor. Off chance of analyzing unfavorably susceptible contact dermatitis, the HCW will take the structure to Materials Management whereby another hand cleanliness item is issued."(16) The University of California Medical Center HH Policy: "Occupational Health Services is responsible for responding to and evaluating staff skin irritation complaints and alternate product recommendations. Accommodation Services provides single-hand cream allocator in the patient consideration unit at stations. The patient care unit managers may order additional lotion dispensers. Apply lotion to your hands at least 4 times a day after each application, making sure that it is left on your skin for at least 30 minutes after each application: (1) With your waking toilet, (2) At break, (3) At the end of your work shift, (4) Upon removal. Use the UCSF-provided lotion. Our manufacturer of hand-held products develops products that are formulated to work together on your skin.(17)

4.4 Contact dermatitis Diagnosis: A practice parameter-update 2015

Summary Statement 1: Consider ACD with differential determination in patients with interminable eczematous or non-eczematous dermatitis; Recommendation quality: Strong; C evidence]

Contact dermatitis may, on the premise, be associated with the clinical appearance of the sores, the dispersion of dermatitis and the absence of different etiologies, or the absence of related foundational signs. Acute CD features erythematous papules, vesicles, and lesions that are crusted. Recurring or persistent episodes of CD will change over time from acute inflammation of

the skin to thickening, hardening, scaling and fissuring of the skin, exaggerating the normal markings known as lichenification. Pruritus is characteristic of both chronic and acute CDs, and constant rubbing of the skin contributes to lichenification. Histologically, CD shows intercellular edema of the epidermis known as spongiosis, with varying degrees of acanthosis (thickening of basal epidermal stratum and spinosum stratum) and superficial perivascular, lymphohistiocytic infiltration. ACD cannot be distinguished from ICD by features on physical examination or histological findings. Patch testing and exposure history to contact allergens is required. Other dermatological conditions may resemble the clinical and additionally histological appearance of CD and these should be considered in the differential determination (Table I), which incorporates skin T-cell lymphoma. The cutaneous biopsy should be interpreted by a pathologist with expertise in dermatopathology, if necessary to differentiate CD from other forms of dermatitis

TABLE I. Allergic contact dermatitis Differential Diagnosis (ACD)

Dermatologic condition	Differentiating features and clues to diagnosis
Irritant contact dermatitis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glazed, parched, or scalded appearance • Sharply circumscribed dermatitis • Healing begins promptly on withdrawal of the offending agent • Patch testing negative
Atopic dermatitis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal or family history of atopy • Early age of onset • Chronic and recurrent • Dry, scaly very pruritic • Typical distribution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facial in infancy • Extensors in early childhood • Flexural areas in adolescence and adults
Seborrheic dermatitis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: areas with sebaceous glands • Scalp, periauricular, face (medial eyebrows, glabella, nasolabial folds), presternal trunk, interscapular • Blepharitis common • Dandruff appears to be a precursor • Distinctive morphology: dull, yellowish-red, sharply demarcated lesions covered with greasy-looking scales
Dyshidrotic eczema	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small (1-2 mm) vesicles, deep seated on nonerythematous base • Palms, soles, and/or lateral aspects of fingers, often symmetrical • Intensely pruritic and itching prodrome • Persists for 2-3 weeks and then resolves by involution and desquamation
Poriasis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plaques typically have dry, thin, silvery-white, or micaceous scale • Auspitz sign: removing scale reveals a smooth, red, glossy membrane with tiny punctate bleeding
Dermatitis herpetiformis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genetic predisposition for gluten sensitivity • Intensely pruritic • Symmetrically grouped (herpetiform) papules and vesicles • Elbows, knees, buttocks, scapula, scalp • Direct immunofluorescence of the skin shows granular IgA at dermal papillae and occasionally along the dermo-epidermal border
Mycoses fungoides and cutaneous T-cell lymphoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patches with thin, wrinkled quality, often with reticulated pigmentation • Pruritus varies from minimal or absent to common in premycotic phase and may precede MF by years • Often on lower trunk and buttocks • Cutaneous biopsy required for confirmation

Summary Statement 2: Patch testing is the best standard for confirming the diagnosis in patients associated with ACD creation. Recommendation Quality: Strong;C evidence]

ACD doubt is the initial phase in making the diagnosis. Fix testing shows where basic or auxiliary ACD is suspected in any patient with intense or constant dermatitis, which is regularly pruritus. For its diagnosis and subsequent administration the historical backdrop of this disease is important. Although clinical history may strongly advise the

reason for ACD, it has moderate affectability (76 percent) and peculiarity (76 percent) in establishing the diagnosis.

As the patient might be unaware of any applicable introduction, any eczematous injury could be compounded by a contact sensitizer for all intents and purposes. Such a prurigo nodularis can also be related to noneczematous ejections with positive PT which is clinically important. Studies have shown the value of fix testing in babies suffering from constant dermatitis. (18) Fixed testing was shown to be practical whenever carried out directly from the bat over the span of infection in patients with incessant ACD by reducing the cost of prediagnostic treatment. Treated CD patients affirmed by fix testing show altogether more noteworthy improvement in the dermatology-explicit personal satisfaction than patients who have not been fix trying. Skin prick testing does not take on a job in the assessment of ACD, but is regularly helpful in patients with unfavorably susceptible CU.

Summary Statement 3: Review home and working environment for various contact allergens wellsprings other than the individual products used by an ACD-associated patient. [Strength of Recommendation: Moderate; D Evidence]

The specific idea of the length of each movement and the event of comparative skin impacts in colleagues may provide pieces of information on the potential reasons for the work related to ICD or ACD. Important changes in the workplaces that cause new direct exposures of the skin to chemicals, including fumes and exhaust, must be tested. A few occupations (e.g. medical clinic workers) require visiting hand washing, and the use of cleansing specialists can negotiate skin obstruction and lead to aggravated hand dermatitis. Since the specialist may be uninformed of explicit chemicals to which the individual in question is uncovered, it may be useful to have MSDS acquired from the producer; as it may be, key sharpening fixations found at low fixations are regularly overlooked (19).

Summary Statement 4: Assess patients, particularly those with hand dermatitis, for both irritant and unfavorably susceptible causes. Recommendation Quality: Strong; evidence C]

Detergents are common causes of hand dermatitis due to skin barrier disruption, and are often associated with hand ICD. Though there are some detergent-related reports of ACD, careful evaluation suggests that allergic responses are rare. Irritants that disrupt the skin barrier may then penetrate into the epidermis resulting in keratinocyte membrane injury and the release of inflammatory cytokines, What's more, add ICD upgrading. This skin hindrance interruption also

allows allergens to enter, and subsequent immunological reactions to be enlisted (20).

CONCLUSION:

It is concluded that compliance with required HH procedures results in damaged skin and increased bacterial load, therefore it is critical that HCWs understand this concept and are given steps (skills) to avoid damaged skin. Although various administrative associations address ICD as an obstacle to HH, there was no agreement among these gatherings as rules for the announcement or control of ICDs by HCW. Failure to provide HCW policies when ICD appears will result in a decline in compliance with HHs. Compliance with HH is a multimodal process that will change as we look at missing links to increase compliance and maintain it.

REFERENCES:

1. World Health Organization (2009). WHO Guidelines on Hand Hygiene in Health Care. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
2. Boyce J. (2008). Hand hygiene compliance monitoring: current perspectives from the USA. *J Hosp Infect.*; 70(suppl 1): pp. 2-7.
3. Visscher M.O. & Randal Wickett R. (2012). Hand hygiene compliance and irritant dermatitis: a juxtaposition of healthcare issues. *Int J Cosmet Sci.*; 34: pp. 402-415.
4. Larson E.L., Aiello A.E., Bastyr J., et. al. (2001). Assessment of two hand hygiene regimens for intensive care unit personnel. *Crit Care Med.*; 29: pp. 944-951.
5. Cimiotti J.P., Marmur E.S., Nesin M., Hamlin-Cook P., Larson E.L. (2003). Adverse reactions associated with an alcohol-based hand antiseptic among nurses in a neonatal intensive care unit. *Am J Infect Control.*; 31: pp. 43-48.
6. Boyce J.M. & Pittet D. (2002). Guideline for hand hygiene in healthcare settings: recommendations of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee and the HIPAC/ SHEA/APIC/IDSA Hand Hygiene Task Force. *Am J Infect Control.*; 30: pp. S1-S46.
7. Lampel H.P., Patel N., Boyse K., O'Brien S.H., Zirwas M.J. (2007). Prevalence of hand dermatitis in inpatient nurses at a United States hospital. *Dermatitis*; 18: pp. 140-142.
8. Visscher M. (2015). Overcoming barriers to hand hygiene compliance. <http://www.medline.com/media/assets/pdf/overcomingbarriers-to-hand-hygiene-compliance.pdf>. Accessed May 1, 2015.
9. Stocks S.J., McNamee R., Turner S., Carder M., Agius R.M. (2015). The impact of national-level interventions to improve hygiene on the incidence of irritant contact dermatitis in healthcare workers: changes in incidence from 1996- 2012 and interrupted times series analysis. *Br J Dermatol.*; 173: pp. 165-171.
10. Pittet D., Hugonnet S., Harbarth S., et. al. (2000). Effectiveness of a hospital-wide programme to improve compliance with hand hygiene. *Lancet.*; 356: pp. 1307-1312.
11. Murphy C. (2015). Healthy hands and hand hygiene compliance: can they co-exist? A self-study monograph for continuing education for registered nurses with an interest in patient safety and infection prevention. http://www.medical.ansell.com.au/sites/default/files/epic/issue2/EPIC_2-final-web.pdf. Accessed September 16, 2015.
12. Public Health Ontario (2015). Protecting your hands fact sheet for health care providers. <http://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/eRepository/hand-care-assessment.pdf>. Accessed April 18, 2015.
13. Rocha L.A., Ferreira de Almeida E.B.L., Gontijo Filho P.P. (2009). (Changes in hands microbiota associated with skin damage because of hand hygiene procedures on the health care workers. *Am J Infect Control.*; 37: pp. 155-159.
14. McGuckin M., Waterman R., Govednik J. (2009). Hand hygiene compliance rates in the United States: a oneyear multicenter collaboration using product/volume usage measurement and feedback. *Am J Med Qual.*;24: pp. 205-213.
15. Department of Veterans Affairs (2015). Required hand hygiene practices: VHA Directive 2001-007. http://www.va.gov/vhapublications/ViewPublication.asp?pub_ID=2367. Accessed April 8, 2015.
16. University of Texas Medical Branch. Hand hygiene for all healthcare workers: Policy 01.14. http://www.utmb.edu/policies_and_procedures/4229926. Accessed April 8, 2015.

17. UCSF Medical Center (2015). Hospital Epidemiology and Infection Control: hand hygiene policy. <http://infectioncontrol.ucsfmedicalcenter.org/sites/infectioncontrol.ucsfmedicalcenter.org/files/Sec%201%202%20Hand%20Hygiene.pdf>. Accessed April 8, 2015.
18. Josefson A., Farm G., Meding B. (2010). Validity of self-reported nickel allergy. Contact Dermatitis; 62: pp. 289-93 (IIb)
19. Belsito D.V., Fransway A.F., Fowler J.F. Jr, Sherertz E.F., Maibach H.I., Mark J.G. Jr, et al. (2002). Allergic contact dermatitis to detergents: a multicenter study to assess prevalence. J Am Acad Dermatol; 46: pp. 200-6.
20. Proksch E. & Brasch J. (2012). Abnormal epidermal barrier in the pathogenesis of contact dermatitis. Clin Dermatol.; 30: pp. 335-44 (IV).

Corresponding Author

Fatimah Khalifah Mohammad Al Sulaiman*

Senior Pharmacist, At Prince Sultan Cardiac Center,
KSA

falsuaiman@pscc.med.sa