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Abstract
Introduction: Lupus vulgaris is the most common form of cutaneous tuberculosis. It may easily be overlooked if a proper differential diagnosis is omitted.
Case presentation: A 46-year-old Turkish woman presented with a 42-year history of erythematous plaque on her left arm. Ziehl–Neelsen and periodic acid-Schiff stains did not show any acid-fast bacilli. Culture from a biopsy specimen was negative for *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. The result of a polymerase chain reaction-based assay for *Mycobacterium* was negative. Histopathologic findings revealed a tuberculoid granuloma containing epithelioid cells, lymphocytes and Langerhans-type giant cells. A diagnosis of lupus vulgaris was made by clinical and histopathologic findings.
Conclusions: The lesion improved after antituberculous therapy, confirming the diagnosis of lupus vulgaris.
Our patient was treated with isoniazid (5mg/kg), rifampin (10mg/kg), ethambutol (25mg/kg), and pyrazinamide (15mg/kg) daily for 2 months, followed by isoniazid and rifampin for 7 months. The cutaneous lesions started to regress within 3 months and had completely healed with atrophic scarring and postinflammatory hyperpigmentation after 9 months (Fig. 3).

Discussion
Lupus vulgaris is generally regarded as a benign, chronic and progressive form of cutaneous tuberculosis that may be associated with tuberculosis of other organs. LV usually originates from an endogenous source of tuberculosis and is spread hematogenously, lymphatically, or by contagious extension [1, 7]. Less commonly, it is acquired exogenously following primary inoculation tuberculosis or BCG vaccination [8]. No endogenous source for tuberculosis was found, so we concluded that primary inoculation was the case for this patient.

LV is characterized by a macule or papule, with a brownish-red color and soft consistency that form larger plaques by peripheral enlargement and coalescence [2, 9].

The lesions of LV are usually located on the head and neck area [1, 3, 10]. LV is rarely seen on arms and legs; those located on the extremities usually occur by reinoculation [2].

Diagnosing LV may be a formidable task. Various diagnostic methods, including culture, Ziehl–Neelsen staining and PCR may be negative in LV, because of the scarcity of the bacilli within the lesional tissue [11, 12]. In conclusion, the diagnosis usually relies on typical clinical and histologic findings, a positive purified protein derivative (PPD) test and a favorable response to antituberculous therapy [1, 13]. In our patient, the diagnosis of LV was based on typical clinical and histologic findings and excellent response to specific antituberculous therapy. The diagnosis of cutaneous tuberculosis is easily made if one considers it in the differential diagnosis, particularly in those patients with a history of tuberculosis and a suggestive clinical presentation; otherwise, it is easily missed.

The differential diagnosis for our patient included sarcoidosis, other cutaneous tuberculosis types such as tuberculosis cutis verrucosa, scrofuloderma, metastatic tuberculous abscess, necrobiotic xanthogranuloma, leishmaniasis, pseudolymphoma and hemangioma.

Conclusions
Tuberculosis is still an important problem in underdeveloped and developing countries due to the poor hygiene conditions and low socioeconomic level. Physicians need to be aware of the diagnosis and treatment of lupus vulgaris and other forms of cutaneous tuberculosis.
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