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Bibliographic Source(s)


Guideline Status

This is the current release of the guideline.


Recommendations

Major Recommendations

Level of evidence grades (I-III) and strength of recommendations (A-C) are defined at the end of the "Major Recommendations" field.

Note from the National Guideline Clearinghouse (NGC): This document is the first section in a series of four and covers methods for diagnosis and assessment of atopic dermatitis (AD). The second guideline in the series will address the management and treatment of AD with pharmacologic and nonpharmacologic topical modalities; the third section will cover phototherapy and systemic treatment options; and the fourth section will address the minimization of disease flares, educational interventions, and use of adjunctive approaches.

Features to Be Considered in the Diagnosis of Patients with AD

Essential Features—Must be present:

Pruritus
Eczema (acute, subacute, chronic):
  - Typical morphology and age-specific patterns*
  - Chronic or relapsing history

*Patterns Include:
1. Facial, neck, and extensor involvement in infants and children
2. Current or previous flexural lesions in any age group
3. Sparing of the groin and axillary regions

Important Features—Seen in most cases, adding support to the diagnosis:
- Early age of onset
- Atopy:
  - Personal and/or family history
  - Immunoglobulin E reactivity
- Xerosis

Associated Features—These clinical associations help to suggest the diagnosis of AD but are too nonspecific to be used for defining or detecting AD for research and epidemiologic studies:
- Atypical vascular responses (e.g., facial pallor, white demography, delayed blanch response)
- Keratosis pilaris/pityriasis alba/hyperlinear palms/ichthyosis
- Ocular/periorbital changes
- Other regional findings (e.g., perioral changes/perianuricular lesions)
- Perifollicular accentuation/lichenification/prurigo lesions

Exclusionary Conditions—It should be noted that a diagnosis of AD depends on excluding conditions, such as:
- Scabies
- Seborrheic dermatitis
- Contact dermatitis (irritant or allergic)
- Ichthyoses
- Cutaneous T-cell lymphoma
- Psoriasis
- Photosensitivity dermatoses
- Immune deficiency diseases
- Erythroderma of other causes


Recommendation for the Diagnosis of AD

Patients with presumed AD should have their diagnosis based on the criteria summarized in the box above. On occasion, skin biopsy specimens or other tests (such as serum immunoglobulin E, potassium hydroxide preparation, patch testing, and/or genetic testing) may be helpful to rule out other or associated skin conditions.

Strength of Recommendations for the Diagnosis and Assessment of AD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Strength of Recommendation</th>
<th>Level of Evidence</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis made using criteria in the box above</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Mevorah et al., 1988; Gu et al., 2001; Lan et al., 2009; Diepgen, Sauerebrei, &amp; Fartasch, 1996; De, Kanwar, &amp; Handa, 2006; Loden, Andersson, &amp; Lindberg, 1998; Samochocki &amp; Dejewska, 2012; Samochocki, Paulochowska, &amp; Zabielski, 2000; Chilmers et al., 2007; Firooz et al., 1999; Saeki et al., 2007; Firooz &amp; Kashani, 2008; Hamada et al., 2005; Williams et al., 1994; Williams et al., 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific biomarkers for diagnosis or severity assessment</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Murat-Susic et al., 2006; Schulte-Herboungen et al., 2007; Aron et al., 2000; Dhar et al., 2005; Gerdes, Kurrat, &amp; Mrowietz, 2009; Aral et al., 2006; Di Lorenzo et al., 2003; El Mongy et al., 2008; Ezzat, Hasun, &amp; Shaheen, 2011; Jahnz-Rozyczki et al., 2005; Nakazato et al., 2008; Belloni Fortina et al., 2006; Gutgesell et al., 2002; Hirai et al., 1996; Hon et al., 2007; Horikawa et al., 2002; Kalkurnu et al., 2003; La Grutta et al., 2005; Leung et al., 2003; Mostafi et al., 2008; Oflazoglu et al., &quot;CD30 expression,&quot; 2008; Oflazoglu et al., &quot;CD40 expression,&quot; 2008; Ott et al., 2010; Raap et al., 2006; Song et al., 2006; Wolkerstorfer et al., 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunoglobulin E levels not routinely recommended</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Schneider et al., 2013; Murat-Susic et al., 2006; Schulte-Herboungen et al., 2007; Gerdes, Kurrat, &amp; Mrowietz, 2009; Aral et al., 2006; Vakilis et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation for the Use of Biomarkers in the Assessment of AD

- For patients with presumed AD, there are no specific biomarkers that can be recommended for diagnosis and/or assessment of disease severity.
- Monitoring of immunoglobulin E levels is not recommended for the routine assessment of disease severity.

Recommendations for Disease Severity and Clinical Outcomes Assessment

- For the general management of patients with AD, available disease severity measurement scales are not recommended for routine clinical practice, because they were not usually designed for this purpose.
- For the general management of patients with AD, available patient quality of life measurement scales are not recommended for routine clinical practice.
- It is recommended that clinicians ask general questions about itch, sleep, impact on daily activity, and persistence of disease, and currently available scales be used mainly when practical.

Recommendations for the Assessment of Clinical Associations of AD

- Physicians should be aware of and assess for conditions associated with AD, such as rhinitis/rhinoconjunctivitis, asthma, food allergy, sleep disturbance, depression, and other neuropsychiatric conditions, and it is recommended that physicians discuss them with the patient as part of the treatment/management plan, when appropriate.
- An integrated, multidisciplinary approach to care may be valuable and is suggested for AD patients who present with common associations.

Definitions:

Levels of Evidence

I. Good-quality patient-oriented evidence (i.e., evidence measuring outcomes that matter to patients: morbidity, mortality, symptom improvement, cost reduction, and quality of life)

II. Limited-quality patient-oriented evidence

III. Other evidence including consensus guidelines, opinion, case studies, or disease-oriented evidence (i.e., evidence measuring intermediate, physiologic, or surrogate end points that may or may not reflect improvements in patient outcomes)
A. Recommendation based on consistent and good quality patient-oriented evidence
B. Recommendation based on inconsistent or limited quality patient-oriented evidence
C. Recommendation based on consensus, opinion, case studies, or disease-oriented evidence

Clinical Algorithm(s)
None provided

Scope

Disease/Condition(s)
Atopic dermatitis (AD; atopic eczema)

Notes:
For the guideline, AD is defined as a chronic, pruritic inflammatory skin disease that occurs most frequently in children, but also affects many adults. Atopic eczema is synonymous with AD.
Other forms of dermatitis, such as irritant dermatitis and allergic contact dermatitis in those without AD, are outside of the scope of this document.

Guideline Category
Diagnosis
Evaluation
Risk Assessment

Clinical Specialty
Allergy and Immunology
Dermatology
Family Practice
Internal Medicine
Pediatrics

Intended Users
Advanced Practice Nurses
Nurses
Physicians

Guideline Objective(s)
To address the diagnosis and assessment of pediatric and adult atopic dermatitis (AD; atopic eczema) of all severities
Target Population

Pediatric and adult patients with atopic dermatitis (AD; atopic eczema)

Interventions and Practices Considered

1. Consideration of essential features, important features, associated features, and exclusionary conditions for diagnosis
2. Disease severity and clinical outcomes assessment:
   - Awareness that there are no specific biomarkers for diagnosis or severity assessment
   - Asking general questions about itch, sleep, impact on daily activity and persistence of disease
3. Assessment of clinical associations:
   - Awareness and assessment of conditions associated with atopic dermatitis (AD) as rhinitis/rhinoconjunctivitis, asthma, food allergy, sleep disturbance, depression, and other neuropsychiatric conditions
   - Integrated, multidisciplinary approach

Note: The following interventions were considered but not recommended for routine clinical practice:

- Monitoring of immunoglobulin E levels for assessment of disease severity
- Existing disease severity measurement scales
- Existing quality of life measurement scales

Major Outcomes Considered

- Occurrence of atopic dermatitis (AD)
- Signs and symptoms of AD
- Associated conditions and risk factors

Methodology

Methods Used to Collect/Select the Evidence

Searches of Electronic Databases

Description of Methods Used to Collect/Select the Evidence

An evidence-based model was used and evidence was obtained using a systematic search of PubMed, the Cochrane Library, and the Global Resource for Eczema Trials (GREAT) databases from November 2003 through November 2012 for clinical questions addressed in the previous version of this guideline published in 2004, and from 1964 to 2012 for all newly identified clinical questions as determined by the work group to be of importance to clinical care. Searches were prospectively limited to publications in the English language. Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms used in various combinations in the literature search included: atopic dermatitis, atopic eczema, diagnosis, diagnostic, severity course, assessment, biomarkers, outcomes measures, morbidity, quality of life, appearance, comorbidity, food allergy, allergic rhinitis, asthma, cancer, sleep, growth effects, developmental effects, behavioral, psychological, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), treatment, and outcome. A total of 1417 abstracts were initially assessed for possible inclusion. After removal of duplicate data, 292 were retained for final review based on relevancy and the highest level of available evidence for the outlined clinical questions.

The Academy's previously published guidelines on atopic dermatitis (AD) were also evaluated, as were other current published guidelines on AD.

Number of Source Documents

292 publications were retained for final review
Methods Used to Assess the Quality and Strength of the Evidence

Rating Scheme for the Strength of the Evidence

Evidence was graded using a 3-point scale based on the quality of study methodology as follows:

I. Good-quality patient-oriented evidence (i.e., evidence measuring outcomes that matter to patients: morbidity, mortality, symptom improvement, cost reduction, and quality of life).

II. Limited-quality patient-oriented evidence.

III. Other evidence, including consensus guidelines, opinion, case studies, or disease-oriented evidence (i.e., evidence measuring intermediate, physiologic, or surrogate end points that may or may not reflect improvements in patient outcomes).

Methods Used to Analyze the Evidence

Review of Published Meta-Analyses

Systematic Review with Evidence Tables

Description of the Methods Used to Analyze the Evidence

Evidence tables were generated for included studies and used by the work group in developing recommendations.

The available evidence was evaluated using a unified system called the Strength of Recommendation Taxonomy (SORT) developed by editors of US family medicine and primary care journals (i.e., *American Family Physician, Family Medicine, Journal of Family Practice,* and BMJ USA). Evidence was graded using a 3-point scale based on the quality of study methodology (e.g., randomized control trial, case control, prospective/retrospective cohort, case series, etc.) and the overall focus of the study (i.e., diagnosis, treatment/prevention/screening, or prognosis) (see the “Rating Scheme for the Strength of the Evidence” field).

Methods Used to Formulate the Recommendations

Expert Consensus

Description of Methods Used to Formulate the Recommendations

A work group of recognized atopic dermatitis (AD) experts was convened to determine the audience and scope of the guideline, and to identify important clinical questions in the diagnosis and assessment of AD.

Clinical questions used to structure the evidence review for the diagnosis and assessment of atopic dermatitis:

- What are the most valid and reliable methods for diagnosing atopic dermatitis?
- What are the most useful tools to assess the severity and course of atopic dermatitis?
- What are the patient- and disease-specific outcome measures used to determine the relative effectiveness of a given treatment for atopic dermatitis?
- What common clinical associations may affect patients with atopic dermatitis?
- What are the epidemiologic risk factors associated with atopic dermatitis?

Clinical recommendations were developed based on the best available evidence. In situations where documented evidence-based data were not available, expert opinion was used to generate the clinical recommendations.

Rating Scheme for the Strength of the Recommendations
Clinical recommendations were developed based on the best available evidence. These are ranked as follows:

- A. Recommendation based on consistent and good-quality patient-oriented evidence.
- B. Recommendation based on inconsistent or limited-quality patient-oriented evidence.
- C. Recommendation based on consensus, opinion, case studies, or disease-oriented evidence.

Cost Analysis

A formal cost analysis was not performed and published cost analyses were not reviewed.

Method of Guideline Validation

Internal Peer Review

Description of Method of Guideline Validation

This guideline has been developed in accordance with the American Academy of Dermatology (AAD)/AAD Association "Administrative Regulations for Evidence-based Clinical Practice Guidelines" (version approved May 2010), which includes the opportunity for review and comment by the entire AAD membership and final review and approval by the AAD Board of Directors.

Evidence Supporting the Recommendations

References Supporting the Recommendations


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PubMed ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Type of Evidence Supporting the Recommendations

The type of supporting evidence is identified and graded for selected recommendations (see the "Major Recommendations" field).

Benefits/Harms of Implementing the Guideline Recommendations

Potential Benefits

Appropriate diagnosis and assessment of pediatric and adult atopic dermatitis (AD, atopic eczema)

Potential Harms

Not stated

Qualifying Statements

- Adherence to these guidelines will not ensure successful treatment in every situation. In addition, these guidelines should not be interpreted as setting a standard of care, or be deemed inclusive of all proper methods of care nor exclusive of other methods of care reasonably directed to obtaining the same results. The ultimate judgment regarding the propriety of any specific therapy must be made by the physician and the patient in light of all the circumstances presented by the individual patient and the known variability and biologic behavior of the disease. This guideline reflects the best available data at the time the guideline was prepared. The results of future studies may require
revisions to the recommendations in this guideline to reflect new data.

- In review of the currently available highest level of evidence, the expert work group acknowledges that while much is known about the diagnosis and evaluation of atopic dermatitis, much has yet to be learned.

Implementation of the Guideline

Description of Implementation Strategy

An implementation strategy was not provided.

Implementation Tools

Patient Resources

For information about availability, see the Availability of Companion Documents and Patient Resources fields below.

Institute of Medicine (IOM) National Healthcare Quality Report Categories

IOM Care Need

Living with Illness

IOM Domain

Effectiveness

Patient-centeredness
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Patient Resources

The following is available:

Please note: This patient information is intended to provide health professionals with information to share with their patients to help them better understand their health and their diagnosed disorders. By providing access to this patient information, it is not the intention of NGC to provide specific medical advice for particular patients. Rather we urge patients and their representatives to review this material and then to consult with a licensed health professional for evaluation of treatment options suitable for them as well as for diagnosis and answers to their personal medical questions. This patient information has been derived and prepared from a guideline for health care professionals included on NGC by the authors or publishers of that original guideline. The patient information is not reviewed by NGC to establish whether or not it accurately reflects the original guideline's content.
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