appropriate diagnosis for our case. The patient’s complete response to steroid therapy, which usually causes deterioration in COVID-19 cases, supports our diagnosis. It is important to be aware of the similar clinical manifestations between EGPA and COVID-19.
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**Histology of skin lesions establishes that the vesicular rash associated with COVID-19 is not ‘varicella-like’**

**Editor**
Several articles recently reported a ‘varicella-like’ rash in patients with COVID-19.1,2 We observed similar cases at our institution. However, although we agree that the clinical picture is original, we reject that ‘varicella-like’ denomination since clinical presentation, as well as some histologic features that we wish to report here for the first time, make it clearly different from varicella.

Three patients with a vesicular rash associated with COVID-19 (RT-PCR test on a nasopharyngeal swab specimen positive for SARS-CoV-2 ARN) were seen at our institution in April, 2020. A biopsy of a vesicle was performed in each. Multiple levels with H&E stain were done; the slides were reviewed independently by two pathologists; only concordant data were validated. A test for SARS-CoV-2 was performed on a vesicle in two patients, and a direct immunofluorescence test on perilesional skin in one.

The main features of the cases are reported in the Table 1. Clinical lesions invariably consisted in small, monomorphic vesicles of 2–3 mm diameter, often excoriated at their top; trunk, especially back, was constantly involved (Fig 1a). Itching was absent or light. Evolution was sometimes irregular, until resolution that occurred without scarring after 10–22 days.

Histology showed a similar pattern in the three cases, with a prominent non-ballooning acantholysis leading to the constitution of an intraepidermal unilocular vesicle, with in two patients a clear suprabasal location (Fig 1b). Eosinophilic dysskeratosis was also constant, with on occasion a striking ‘pomegranate-like’ aspect (Fig 1c). Features more suggestive of a viral infection were present once (Fig 1d). No vasculitis was seen. The direct immunofluorescence performed in one patient and the two SARS-CoV-2 PCR tests performed on vesicles were negative.

The rash that we observed was similar to that reported by Marzano2, and constituted a picture that we agree to be evocative of COVID-19. But, in addition, the histologic pattern of prominent acantholysis and dysskeratosis with constitution of an unilocular intraepidermal vesicle in a suprabasal location, reported here for the first time, contributed to delineate a unique entity. Indeed, this pattern is very different from what is seen in varicella, in which major nuclear atypia, large multinucleated cells, acantholysis secondary to ballooning degeneration, involvement of the epidermis basal layer and vasculitis are regularly seen. Other acantholytic disorder (autoimmune or familial pemphigus, Grover’s transient acantholytic dermatosis) do share etc.
some histologic features with our cases, but with a distinct clinical context. Actually, we are not aware of a viral rash in which such picture is present.

Considering pathology in COVID-19, data are scarce and rely mainly on autopsies. Reports focused on the description of inflammatory and post-inflammatory changes (such as fibrosis) in the lungs. Aspects suggestive of a more direct viral effect (multinucleated cells, viral inclusions) have been rarely reported.

In conclusion, this picture, clinical as well as histologic, has few in common with varicella, as with other known viral rashes. It appears to us that the denomination ‘varicella-like rash’ is poorly indicative, and that such a misnomer should no longer be used. To name this entity, we suggest ‘COVID-19-associated acantholytic rash’, a denomination underlining a feature that we found striking.

Concerning pathogenesis, angiotensin-converting enzyme 2, the receptor for SARS-CoV-2, has been identified on epidermis basal cell layer keratinocytes; that might suggest a direct pathogenic effect of the virus here, leading to acantholysis and dyskeratosis. Finally, despite the SARS-CoV-2 research on vesicles in our patients was negative, the aspects evocative of a direct viral effect that were seen suggested the presence of viral replication; this should probably encourage isolation precautions until such lesions have resolved.
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Table 1 Clinical and histologic data in three patients with COVID-19-associated vesicular rash

|                        | Case 1          | Case 2          | Case 3          |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Age (years)            | 55              | 55              | 50              |
| Sex                    | Female          | Male            | Female          |
| General symptoms       |                 |                 |                 |
| Fever                  | Yes             | Yes             | No              |
| Asthenia               | No              | Yes             | No              |
| Respiratory symptoms   | No              | Cough, dyspnoea, mild desaturation | Light cough |
| Anosmia                | Yes             | No              | No              |
| Time to resolution     | 2 days          | 18 days         | 2 days          |
| Skin symptoms          |                 |                 |                 |
| Day of occurrence      | Day 6           | Day 6           | Day 21          |
| Itch                   | Light, irregular| No              | Light, irregular|
| Involved sites          | Trunk           | Trunk           | Trunk, upper limbs, face |
| Time to resolution      | 11 days         | 22 days         | 10 days         |
| Any drug intake in the 5 days preceding rash | No              | No              | No              |
| Histologic data        |                 |                 |                 |
| Date of biopsy         | Day 10 of rash  | Day 6 of rash   | Day 7 of rash   |
| Intraepidermal vesicle | Yes             | Yes             | Yes             |
| Acantholysis           | Yes             | Yes             | Yes             |
| Dyskeratosis           | Yes             | Yes             | Yes             |
| Suprabasal clefts      | Yes             | Yes             | No              |
| Balloonization of cells | No              | No              | No              |
| Nuclear viral inclusions | Yes            | No              | No              |
| Multinucleated cells   | Yes             | No              | No              |
| Mild dermal inflammatory infiltrates | Yes            | Yes             | Yes             |
| Dermal eosinophils      | Yes             | Yes             | No              |

Figure 1 (a) COVID-19- associated vesicular rash involving the back in a patient. (b–d) Histologic features of COVID-19-associated vesicular rash, haematoxylin-eosin staining. (b) Acantholysis, intraepidermal vesicle, suprabasal clefts. (c) Prominent dyskeratosis with ‘pomegranate-like’ aspect. (d) Suspected nuclear viral inclusions (black arrows), multinucleated cells (white arrows).
Exanthema and eosinophilia in COVID-19 patients: has viral infection a role in drug induced exanthemas?

To the Editor
At the present time, the whole world is faced with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Cutaneous manifestations in these patients are being increasingly reported, including rash, acrocyanosis or urticaria.1 Exanthemas in COVID-19 patients are becoming frequent in our daily practice, and they pose a challenge regarding their pathogenesis.

We present a retrospective case series of twelve adult patients (6 male/6 female) with a mean age of 66,3 years (47–79). All patients had pneumonia and nasopharyngeal swab PCR positive for SARS-CoV-2 and had received treatment for COVID-19 per protocol established. Table 1 shows the characteristics of these patients.

All patients developed an itching papular exanthema after an average of 20,4 days (10–28) from their admission. At the exanthema onset, all the drugs had already been discontinued; therefore, topical corticosteroids were prescribed. However, the exanthema showed a cephalocaudal progression and confluence with islands of sparing in all cases. Seven patients developed violaceous-areas and/or target-like (Fig. 1) lesions; of them, three developed fever and facial oedema. In one patient, the progression of the cutaneous lesions coincided with reintroduction of hydroxychloroquine and lopinavir/ritonavir. Cutaneous biopsy was performed in two of these patients: one of them showed a superficial perivascular inflammation with eosinophils and the other showed a lichenoid pattern with eosinophils. Both were compatible with drug reaction.

Systemic corticosteroids were prescribed in six patients with violaceous areas, starting at 0.5–1 mg/kg and then tapered over the ensuing 2–4 weeks with progressive improvement. The other cases improved with topical corticosteroids.

It has been suggested that underlying viral infections may increase the risk of adverse drug reactions. The association of viral infections and drug reactions has been described in many clinical situations, such as the ampicillin rash in infectious mononucleosis or the increased risk of drug reactions in AIDS patients.2 In DRESS syndrome, viral reactivation (especially HHV-6) is a characteristic feature. Antiviral immune responses may facilitate drug allergy development, and several biological mechanisms have been proposed for this effect, including excessive production of proinflammatory cytokines, which has been observed in COVID-19.3,4

The presence of exanthema and eosinophilia suggests a drug reaction in our patients. DRESS syndrome, although unusual, has been reported related to hydroxychloroquine but it has not been described with lopinavir/ritonavir.5 Other drug reactions have also been reported with the treatments used for COVID-19 management. However, the high frequency we are observing these reactions in the COVID-19 pandemic make us think that SARS-CoV-2 infection may have a role in their pathogenesis.

We suggest that several exanthemas may result from interaction between antiviral immune response and drugs. Nevertheless, more studies are needed to confirm this hypothesis. We must be cautious until then. It would be therefore strongly recommended that all COVID-19 patients with exanthema and eosinophilia were investigated for drug sensitization.

We suggest that systemic corticosteroids should be considered in those exanthemas that progress to violaceous areas or target-like lesions, since in our experience topical corticosteroids have not been able to achieve an improvement in these cases.
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