allergies

MDPI

Review

A False Allergic Contact Dermatitis? A Review of Earlobe Eczema Beyond Nickel Allergy: Irritant Mechanisms and Psoriatic Diathesis

Ramon Grimalt

Department of Dermatology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universitat Internacional de Catalunya, 08221 Barcelona, Spain; rgrimalt@uic.cat

Abstract

Background: Dermatitis affecting the earlobe is a highly frequent clinical presentation, predominantly attributed to Allergic Contact Dermatitis (ACD) caused by metallic ions like nickel from earrings. However, a significant subset of patients presents with recurrent eczematous lesions highly suggestive of ACD but with inconclusive or negative patch test results, posing a profound diagnostic and therapeutic dilemma. Objective: This comprehensive review critically evaluates the differential diagnosis of earlobe eczema in the context of negative patch tests. Drawing from a representative case of a 30-year-old female with recurrent earlobe eczema and a strong family history of psoriasis, we explore alternative non-immunological and endogenous mechanisms, specifically Irritant Contact Dermatitis (ICD) and the Koebner Phenomenon on a background of Psoriatic Diathesis. Methods: We performed an extensive review of the current literature focusing on the epidemiology and pathogenesis of metal ACD, non-allergic mechanisms of jewelry-induced dermatitis (ICD), the molecular basis of the Koebner phenomenon, and the clinical overlap between eczema and psoriasis (Eczematous Psoriasis). Results: The localized nature of the inflammation, coupled with the absence of generalized nickel sensitivity, strongly suggests that the mechanical and occlusive trauma from earrings can induce a purely irritant reaction. Crucially, the presence of a familial psoriatic diathesis supports the hypothesis that this local irritation acts as a Koebner phenomenon trigger, leading to an eczematous manifestation of an underlying psoriatic tendency. Conclusions: Not all recurrent eczematous lesions at common contact sites are caused by ACD. Clinicians must adopt an integrated diagnostic approach, factoring in personal and family history alongside patch test results, to differentiate true allergy from ICD and the Koebner phenomenon. This nuanced perspective is vital for providing appropriate counseling (strict jewelry avoidance) and targeted, often steroid-sparing, management (e.g., topical calcineurin inhibitors) for a durable therapeutic outcome.

Keywords: psoriasis; Koebner; contact dermatitis; nickel; eczematous psoriasis; false contact dermatitis

Check for updates

Academic Editor: Pierre Rougé

Received: 28 November 2025
Revised: 31 December 2025
Accepted: 14 January 2026
Published: 27 January 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.

1. Introduction

Dermatitis of the earlobe represents a classic and common clinical scenario in dermatology. For decades, the etiology of itchy, erythematous, and scaly rashes localized to areas of direct contact with jewelry has been overwhelmingly linked to Allergic Contact Dermatitis (ACD), with nickel being the most notorious sensitizer [1,2]. The high prevalence of nickel sensitization—estimated to affect one in five women—is intimately tied to the widespread practice of ear piercing and the use of inexpensive metal alloys [2,3].

1.1. Earrings in Culture and History: A Clinical Context

Throughout history, the practice of ear piercing and the wearing of earrings have transcended mere aesthetic preference, serving as potent symbols of social status, religious devotion, and cultural identity. From the intricate gold hoops found in ancient Sumerian graves (c. 2500 BCE) to the protective amulets worn in Ancient Egypt, earrings have been a near-ubiquitous form of human expression. In many civilizations, such as in ancient Persia or among the seafaring communities of the Age of Discovery, earrings also functioned as a form of portable wealth or a "funeral insurance," ensuring a proper burial for the wearer regardless of where they died.

In the modern era, the cultural significance of earrings has evolved into a global fashion phenomenon, with piercing practices extending beyond the earlobe to the cartilage and other cutaneous sites. However, this widespread adoption has also increased the frequency of localized skin complications. Historically, many cultures used materials like bone, wood, or high-purity gold, which are relatively inert. In contrast, the contemporary mass production of jewelry often involves alloys containing nickel, cobalt, or synthetic coatings. These materials not only pose a risk for allergic contact dermatitis but also act as chronic mechanical irritants that can trigger underlying dermatological conditions.

Within the specific framework of the psoriatic patient, the earring becomes more than an ornament; it represents a persistent site of micro-trauma and chemical exposure. The intersection of this ancient cultural tradition with modern pathophysiology is where we find the "isomorphic response." When a patient with a psoriatic diathesis experiences the repetitive friction or the minor trauma of the piercing itself, the skin's immune response is bypassed or overstimulated. This transforms the site of a cultural ritual into a clinical manifestation, where the history of the ornament meets the biological reality of the Koebner phenomenon.

1.2. The Diagnostic Conundrum

The diagnostic standard for ACD is the patch test. A positive test provides definitive proof of sensitization, leading to the straightforward recommendation of allergen avoidance. However, clinical experience often reveals a subset of patients who present with a history and morphology highly suggestive of nickel allergy yet exhibit entirely negative patch tests [4]. This diagnostic gap, exemplified by our reported case of a 30-year-old female with recurrent earlobe eczema despite negative patch test results to nickel and other common allergens [5], demands a deeper examination of alternative mechanisms.

The persistence of the rash in the presence of continuous local irritation, even after the presumptive allergen has been ruled out, highlights two critical considerations that are often overlooked in routine clinical practice:

1. Irritant Contact Dermatitis (ICD): The role of mechanical trauma, pressure, and occlusion caused by the jewelry itself, independent of an allergic response.
2. Endogenous Predisposition: The influence of an underlying psoriatic diathesis, whereby the irritation acts as a non-specific trigger for a dermatosis—a manifestation known as the Koebner phenomenon [6].

1.3. Scope and Organization of the Review

This review transitions from the conventional view of earlobe eczema as primarily an allergic disorder to a complex differential diagnosis that integrates local irritation with genetic susceptibility. By utilizing our index case as a guiding example, we aim to:

- Critically review the established pathogenesis of nickel ACD and its diagnostic limitations.
- Detail the mechanisms and clinical presentation of non-immunological ICD at the earlobe.

- Elucidate the molecular pathways and clinical relevance of the Koebner phenomenon in individuals with a familial history of psoriasis.
- Propose an integrated diagnostic algorithm and nuanced management strategies for this challenging group of patients.

This approach will serve as a crucial reminder for clinicians that a comprehensive personal and family history is indispensable when the laboratory and clinical findings are incongruent, preventing the misdiagnosis of a localized eczematous manifestation of an underlying inflammatory potential.

2. Contact Dermatitis of the Earlobe: Beyond Simple Allergy

The clinical presentation of eczematous lesions on the earlobe is highly suggestive of Allergic Contact Dermatitis (ACD) due to metals, most commonly nickel [1,4]. However, relying solely on this clinical suspicion constitutes a diagnostic pitfall when results of the patch tests are inconclusive, necessitating a comprehensive differential diagnosis that includes Irritant Contact Dermatitis (ICD).

2.1. Allergic Contact Dermatitis (ACD) to Nickel: The Immunological Mechanism

Nickel remains the preeminent contact allergen globally, with sensitization rates consistently reported between 8% and 19% in various populations, disproportionately affecting women due to exposure from jewelry and piercings [2,3,7].

Pathogenesis and Diagnosis

ACD is a classic Type IV (delayed type) hypersensitivity reaction, where the nickel ion acts as a hapten [8]. This hapten binds to epidermal proteins, creating an antigenic complex that is internalized and processed by Langerhans Cells (LCs). These LCs then migrate to draining lymph nodes to present the altered peptides to naïve T cells, initiating the sensitization phase. Upon re-exposure, memory T cells are activated, releasing pro-inflammatory cytokines such as IFN-gamma and IL-17, leading to the characteristic eczematous reaction (erythema, pruritus, vesicles) [8,9].

The definitive diagnostic tool for nickel ACD is the patch test using nickel sulfate. The European Union's Nickel Directive has successfully regulated the amount of nickel released by consumer products, thereby mitigating the incidence of new sensitizations; however, sensitization remains highly prevalent due to historical exposures [2,3]. The complete absence of a reaction in a standard patch test series shifts the diagnostic focus away from a true immunological allergy.

2.2. Irritant Contact Dermatitis (ICD) of the Earlobe: The Non-Immunological Mimic

When ACD is ruled out by negative patch tests, the recurrent eczema localized to the earlobe must be rigorously evaluated for non-allergic etiologies, primarily Irritant Contact Dermatitis (ICD). This scenario effectively creates a "false allergic contact dermatitis" [5].

2.2.1. ICD Pathophysiology

ICD is a non-specific inflammatory response resulting from direct cytotoxicity to epidermal cells, a mechanism mediated primarily by innate immunity [10]. It does not require prior sensitization. The key events include:

- Barrier Disruption: The irritant compromises the lipid barrier of the stratum corneum, increasing trans-epidermal water loss (TEWL) and permeability [11].
- Keratinocyte Damage: Direct cellular damage triggers the release of pro-inflammatory mediators (e.g., IL-beta, TNF-alpha) from keratinocytes, initiating the inflammatory cascade [10].

2.2.2. Mechanical and Occlusive Irritants in Jewelry Wear

At the earlobe, ICD is often triggered by:

- Mechanical Stress and Pressure: Heavy or tightly fitting earrings exert continuous mechanical pressure and friction on the soft tissues. This repetitive trauma causes micro-injuries and low-grade inflammation, mimicking the appearance of chronic allergic eczema [12,13].
- Occlusion and Moisture: The presence of an earring creates a localized occlusive environment, hindering the evaporation of sweat, sebum, and topical product residues. This environment acts as a mild chemical irritant or increases the penetration of residual metal ions (leaching) [14,15].

This scenario underscores that the history of "intolerance to earrings" may be a manifestation of ICD, a factor crucial for the differential diagnosis in our index case.

3. The Koebner Phenomenon and Psoriatic Diathesis: An Endogenous Trigger

The patient's strong family history of psoriasis introduces a crucial genetic predisposition that can explain the recurrent nature of the lesion despite irritant avoidance. This brings into play the concept of the Koebner phenomenon [6,16].

3.1. Definition and Significance of the Koebner Phenomenon

The Koebner phenomenon (KP), or isomorphic response, describes the appearance of new skin lesions characteristic of an underlying disease (notably psoriasis) at sites of cutaneous injury or trauma [6,16]. In our case, the mechanical irritation from the earring serves as the trauma needed to trigger the KP.

Patients with a psoriatic diathesis frequently exhibit more pronounced clinical manifestations at sites subject to repetitive mechanical trauma. While these localized flares are occasionally triggered by external irritants—leading to a potential misdiagnosis of allergic or contact dermatitis—they often represent a classic manifestation of the Koebner phenomenon. This diagnostic challenge is particularly prevalent when the inciting factor is a specific material or chemical; however, the precise localization at the point of friction or injury suggests a mechanical induction rather than a purely immunological hypersensitivity.

The pathophysiology underlying this phenomenon involves a complex interplay between keratinocytes, dendritic cells, and T-lymphocytes. Upon cutaneous injury, damaged keratinocytes release self-DNA and antimicrobial peptides, such as LL-37, which form complexes that activate plasmacytoid dendritic cells. This cascade triggers the massive production of Type I interferons and subsequent activation of the IL-23/IL-17 axis, the primary driver of psoriatic plaque formation. In the context of repeated micro-trauma, a state of chronic 'pre-inflammation' is maintained, lowering the threshold for the recruitment of pathogenic T-cells to the dermis.

Furthermore, the clinical distinction between an allergic reaction and a Koebnerized lesion is vital for therapeutic management. While an allergic response typically requires sensitization and may generalize, Koebner-induced psoriasis remains strictly localized to the area of physical stress. Understanding this distinction allows clinicians to move beyond symptomatic treatment and address the behavioral or occupational factors—such as repetitive pressure or friction—that contribute to disease persistence. Consequently, patient education regarding skin protection and the avoidance of unnecessary cutaneous irritation remains a cornerstone in the long-term management of those with a highly reactive psoriatic constitution.

Furthermore the understanding of the origin of the skin reaction is crucial for the patient: in allergic contact dermatitis the cause is external in a Koebnerized plaque of psoriasis the cause is the patient suffering from the psoriatic constitution.

Molecular Mechanisms of the Koebner Phenomenon

The KP involves a complex immunologic and vascular response where physical damage activates the immune system in a genetically susceptible host [17]. The sequence of events is thought to involve:

- Trauma-Induced Cell Stress: Injury releases damage-associated molecular patterns (DAMPs) [17].
- Innate Immune Activation: DAMPs activate local resident immune cells, leading to the rapid release of pro-inflammatory cytokines, including IL-beta, IL-6, and TNF-alpha [18].
- T-cell Recruitment: In individuals with a psoriatic diathesis, this innate response is amplified, attracting and activating pathogenic T-cells (Th17 and Th1 cells) that drive the psoriatic inflammatory loop, characterized by the production of IL-17 and IL-22 [18,19].

3.2. Psoriatic Diathesis and Eczematous Psoriasis

The family history of psoriasis suggests a psoriatic diathesis—a genetic susceptibility that may be subclinical [20].

The concept of "Eczematous Psoriasis" is highly relevant here [21]. Our patient's lesion, presenting as an erythematous, mildly scaly patch that is pruritic (an eczematous feature) but highly localized and triggered by a mechanical irritant (suggestive of KP/Psoriasis), fits within this spectrum.

The earlobe lesion can be interpreted as a Koebner response at a site of chronic irritation, unveiling the underlying psoriatic diathesis [22]. This interpretation is crucial as it guides management toward agents targeting the T-cell pathology, such as topical calcineurin inhibitors, in addition to corticosteroids.

4. Integrated Differential Diagnosis and Management Strategies

The negative patch tests necessitate an integrated approach to effectively differentiate between ICD and a localized Koebner phenomenon [23].

4.1. The Diagnostic Algorithm for Earlobe Eczema

A pragmatic algorithm for chronic earlobe eczema with negative patch tests should proceed as follows: (Table 1)

- Irritant Exclusion: Strict avoidance of all jewelry for 4–6 weeks.
- Historical Review: Detailed inquiry into personal and family history for signs of psoriasis [6,24].
- Biopsy (If Recalcitrant): To distinguish histopathologically between chronic eczema and early/eczematous psoriasis [25].

Table 1. Differential diagnosis between allergic, irritant and Koebner psoriatic response.

Feature	ACD (Nickel)	ICD (Irritant)	KP (Psoriatic Diathesis)
Patch Test	Positive	Negative	Negative
Family History of Psoriasis	Irrelevant	Irrelevant	Crucial
Response to Irritant Avoidance	Complete	Complete (usually fast)	Recalcitrant/Relapses easily
Primary Mechanism	Type IV Hypersensitivity	Direct Cytotoxicity	Trauma-induced Cytokine Cascade

4.2. Specific Management Based on Etiology

4.2.1. Management of Irritant Eczema (ICD Component)

The fundamental treatment is absolute avoidance of the irritant (all earrings). Therapy includes:

- Barrier Repair: Emollients and moisturizers to restore the integrity of the stratum corneum [11,26].
- Topical Anti-inflammatories: Short courses of low- to mid-potency topical corticosteroids [27].

4.2.2. Management of Koebner Phenomenon (Psoriatic Diathesis Component)

If the eczema is deemed to be a manifestation of the Koebner phenomenon, the therapeutic approach must address the underlying T-cell mediated inflammation [19].

- Topical Calcineurin Inhibitors (TCIs): Agents like tacrolimus or pimecrolimus are effective for sensitive areas, offering a steroid-sparing option by inhibiting T-cell activation, and are useful for maintenance therapy [28].
- Vitamin D Analogues: Can be used to reduce keratinocyte hyperproliferation, often combined with corticosteroids for refractory lesions [29].

5. Conclusions and Future Perspectives

The case presented serves as a critical pedagogical tool in dermatological diagnosis. It underscores the necessity of moving beyond simple algorithms that rely solely on clinical presentation and immediate allergen testing.

5.1. Synthesis of Findings

The localized inflammation in our index case is most accurately defined as an Irritant Contact Dermatitis (ICD) acting as a trigger for the Koebner Phenomenon in a patient with a Psoriatic Diathesis [5,21]. This synthesis prevents mislabeling the patient as "allergic to jewelry," guiding management toward elimination of the irritant and targeted anti-inflammatory therapy aimed at the underlying T-cell mediated pathology.

5.2. Clinical Implications

Strict Avoidance is Key: The primary intervention is the absolute and permanent avoidance of all earrings, regardless of their metallic composition, as the trigger is the mechanical irritation and occlusion [13].

Targeted Topical Therapy: Management should utilize short courses of topical corticosteroids for acute flares, followed by Topical Calcineurin Inhibitors (TCIs) for maintenance therapy, as TCIs can effectively dampen the T-cell activation central to the Koebner response [28].

5.3. Future Perspectives

Further research is warranted to better characterize the subtle differences between chronic ICD, Eczematous Psoriasis, and Koebner-triggered lesions. Advancements in non-invasive diagnostic tools, such as the analysis of cytokine profiles in tape-stripped epidermal samples [30], could provide molecular evidence to confirm the dominance of DAMP-driven innate immunity versus the Th17-mediated response in situ [31].

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Thyssen, J.P.; Maibach, H.I. Nickel release from earrings purchased in the United States: The San Francisco earring study. *J. Am. Acad. Dermatol.* **2008**, *58*, 1000–1005. [CrossRef]
2. Thyssen, J.P.; Johansen, J.D. The European Union Nickel Directive revisited: A bicentennial review of nickel allergy in Europe. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* **2009**, *124*, 1214–1222.
3. Frosch, P.J.; Duus Johansen, J.; Schuttelaar, M.L.A.; Silvestre, J.F.; Sánchez-Pérez, J.; Weisshaar, E.; Uter, W.; ESSCA network. The European Surveillance System on Contact Allergies (ESSCA): Geographical distribution of contact allergies in Europe, 2011/12. *J. Eur. Acad. Dermatol. Venereol.* **2015**, *29*, 294–305.
4. Geier, J.; Lessmann, H.; Dickel, H.; Frosch, P.J.; Koch, P.; Becker, D.; Jappe, U.; Aberer, W.; Schnuch, A.; Uter, W. Patch test results with the metalworking fluid series of the German Contact Dermatitis Research Group (DKG). *Contact Dermat.* **2004**, *51*, 118–130. [CrossRef]
5. Grimalt, R. A False Allergic Contact Dermatitis? An Irritant Eczema of the Earlobe Triggered by Nickel-Containing Earrings in a Patient with Psoriatic Diathesis. (Presented as a Personal Observation in the Hospital Clinical Clinical Session).
6. Sagi, L.; Trau, H. The Koebner phenomenon. *Clin. Dermatol.* **2011**, *29*, 231–236. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
7. Thyssen, J.P.; Uter, W.; McFadden, J.; Menné, T.; Spiewak, R.; Vigan, M.; Gimenez-Arnau, A.; Lidén, C. The EU Nickel Directive revisited--future steps towards better protection against nickel allergy. *Contact Dermat.* **2011**, *64*, 121–125. [CrossRef]
8. Martin, S.F.; Esser, P.R.; Weber, F.C.; Jakob, T.; Freudenberg, M.A.; Schmidt, M.; Goebeler, M. Mechanisms of chemical-induced innate immunity in allergic contact dermatitis. *Allergy* **2011**, *66*, 1152–1163. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
9. Pesqué, D.; Andrades, E.; Berenguer-Molins, P.; Perera-Bel, J.; Clarós, M.; Bódalo-Torruella, M.; González-Farré, M.; Gallardo, F.; Pujol, R.M.; Giménez-Arnau, A.M. Transcriptomic Analysis of Allergic Patch Test Reactions in Non-Atopic Patients: A Comparative Study Across Multiple Allergens. *Allergy* **2025**, *80*, 3043–3054. [CrossRef]
10. Ale, I.S.; Maibach, H.I. Irritant contact dermatitis. *Rev. Environ. Health* **2014**, *29*, 195–206. [CrossRef]
11. Elias, P.M. Skin barrier function from a developmental and evolutionary perspective. *J. Investig. Dermatol.* **2004**, *122*, xviii–xix.
12. Lammintausta, K.; Maibach, H.I. Exogenous and endogenous factors in skin irritation. *Int. J. Dermatol.* **1990**, *29*, 254–260.
13. Frosch, P.J.; Kurte, A. A model system for the assessment of irritant intensity. *Contact Dermat.* **1994**, *31*, 221–227.
14. Bocca, B.; Forte, G.; Senofonte, O.; Violante, N.; Paoletti, L.; De Berardis, B.; Petrucci, F.; Cristaudo, A. A pilot study on the content and the release of Ni and other allergenic metals from cheap earrings available on the Italian market. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2007**, *388*, 24–34. [CrossRef]
15. DeKoven, J.G.; Warshaw, E.M.; Reeder, M.J.; Atwater, A.R.; Silverberg, J.I.; Belsito, D.V.; Sasseville, D.; Zug, K.A.; Taylor, J.S.; Pratt, M.D.; et al. North American Contact Dermatitis Group Patch Test Results: 2019–2020. *Dermatitis* **2023**, *34*, 90–104. [CrossRef]
16. Boyd, A.S.; Neldner, K.H. The isomorphic response of Koebner. *Int. J. Dermatol.* **1990**, *29*, 401–410. [CrossRef]
17. Sticherling, M. The Koebner phenomenon in psoriasis. *Hautarzt* **2005**, *56*, 1047–1052.
18. Furue, M.; Furue, K.; Tsuji, G.; Nakahara, T. Interleukin-17A and Keratinocytes in Psoriasis. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **2020**, *21*, 1275. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
19. Lowes, M.A.; Suarez-Farinas, M.; Krueger, J.G. Immunology of psoriasis. *Annu. Rev. Immunol.* **2014**, *32*, 227–255. [CrossRef]
20. Gudjonsson, J.E.; Elder, J.T. Psoriasis. *Lancet* **2007**, *370*, 637–640.
21. Bernhard, J.D. Eczematous psoriasis: A common variant of a common disease. *Cuthis* **1991**, *48*, 219–220.
22. Hönigsmann, H. Lyme-Borreliose: Kutane Manifestationen. *Hautarzt* **2005**, *56*, 783–796.
23. Mortz, C.G.; Andersen, K.E. New allergens in children. *Curr. Opin. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* **2017**, *17*, 287–292.
24. Menter, A.; Strober, B.E.; Kaplan, D.H.; Kivelevitch, D.; Prater, E.F.; Stoff, B.; Armstrong, A.W.; Connor, C.; Cordoro, K.M.; Davis, D.M.; et al. Joint AAD-NPF guidelines of care for the management and treatment of psoriasis with biologics. *J. Am. Acad. Dermatol.* **2019**, *80*, 1029–1072. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
25. Ackerman, A.B. *Histologic Diagnosis of Inflammatory Skin Diseases*, 2nd ed.; Williams & Wilkins: Philadelphia, PA, USA, 1997.
26. Wollenberg, A.; Barbarot, S.; Bieber, T.; Christen-Zaech, S.; Deleuran, M.; Fink-Wagner, A.; Gieler, U.; Girolomoni, G.; Lau, S.; Muraro, A.; et al. Consensus-based European guidelines for treatment of atopic eczema (atopic dermatitis) in adults and children: Part, I. *J. Eur. Acad. Dermatol. Venereol.* **2018**, *32*, 657–682. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
27. Uva, L.; Miguel, D.; Pinheiro, C.; Antunes, J.; Cruz, D.; Ferreira, J.; Filipe, P. Mechanisms of Action of Topical Corticosteroids in Psoriasis. *Int. J. Endocrinol.* **2012**, *2012*, 561018. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

28. Gribetz, C.; Ling, M.; Lebwohl, M.; Pariser, D.; Draelos, Z.; Gottlieb, A.B.; Zaias, N.; Chen, D.M.; Parneix-Spake, A.; Hultsch, T.; et al. Pimecrolimus cream 1% in the treatment of intertriginous psoriasis: A double-blind, randomized study. *J. Am. Acad. Dermatol.* **2004**, *51*, 731–738. [CrossRef]
29. Van de Kerkhof, P.C. *Textbook of Psoriasis*; Blackwell Science: Oxford, UK, 2003.
30. Clausen, M.L.; Slotved, H.C.; Krogfelt, K.A.; Agner, T. Tape Stripping Technique for Stratum Corneum Protein Analysis. *Sci. Rep.* **2016**, *6*, 19918. [CrossRef]
31. Tsoi, L.C.; Spain, S.L.; Knight, J.; Ellinghaus, E.; Stuart, P.E.; Capon, F.; Ding, J.; Li, Y.; Tejasvi, T.; Gudjonsson, J.E.; et al. Identification of 15 new psoriasis susceptibility loci highlights the role of innate genetics. *Nat. Genet.* **2012**, *44*, 1341–1348. [CrossRef]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.