



European Standard Series Patch Test Results in Pediatric Allergic Contact Dermatitis Patients: A Single-Center Experience

Ahmet SELMANOGLU¹ , Aslı KUZU KUSAKLI¹ , Funda AYTEKİN GÜVENİR¹ , Zeynep Sengül EMEKSİZ² ,
Emine DİBEK MISIRLIOĞLU² 

¹ Department of Pediatric Allergy and Immunology, Ankara Bilkent City Hospital, Ankara

² Department of Pediatric Allergy and Immunology, University of Health Sciences, Ankara Bilkent City Hospital, Ankara

Corresponding Author: Emine Dibek Mısırlıoğlu ✉ edibekm@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Background: Allergic contact dermatitis (ACD) is a Type IV hypersensitivity reaction that can be challenging to diagnose in children due to its resemblance to other dermatologic conditions such as atopic dermatitis. Despite historical beliefs, recent studies show that ACD is prevalent in pediatric populations, with an increasing number of cases reported.

Objective: This study aimed to investigate the prevalence of allergic sensitization in children with suspected ACD, identify the most common allergens, and examine the relationship between allergic diseases and patch test positivity.

Materials and Methods: A retrospective study was conducted at the Pediatric Allergy and Immunology Clinic between April 2023 and December 2024, including children aged 2–18 years. Patients underwent patch testing using the European standard series and were assessed for demographic data, allergic disease history, and laboratory tests.

Results: A total of 99 patients with suspected allergic contact dermatitis (ACD) were evaluated, with a median age of 14 years (IQR: 9–16). Patch test positivity was detected in 58 patients (58.6%), and clinically relevant sensitizations were identified in 32 of them (55.1%). The most commonly affected site was the hand (44%), frequently associated with metal exposure. At least one allergic disease was present in 50.5% of the patients, with atopic dermatitis (34.4%) being the most prevalent. Skin prick test positivity was observed in 28% of the patients, predominantly to pollen (22.2%). The most frequently detected contact allergens were metals (26.8%), particularly nickel sulfate (11.8%).

Conclusion: ACD is a common condition in children, with metals and preservatives as the most prevalent allergens. Early diagnosis through patch testing and proactive management of environmental exposures are crucial for improving patient outcomes and reducing the impact of ACD on the quality of life.

Keywords: Patch test, European Standard Series, Allergic Contact Dermatitis, Pediatric

INTRODUCTION

Allergic Contact Dermatitis (ACD) is a delayed-type hypersensitivity reaction (Type IV hypersensitivity) that occurs when the skin comes into contact with an allergen, leading to an exaggerated immune response. Unlike immediate allergic reactions (such as urticaria or anaphylaxis),

ACD develops gradually over 24 to 72 hours after exposure. This condition is characterized by redness, itching, swelling, and sometimes blistering, particularly at the site of contact with the allergen (1). ACD is a common dermatologic condition that can be particularly challenging to diagnose in children due to several factors. It often mimics

or coexists with atopic dermatitis (AD), a prevalent childhood skin condition, leading clinicians to delay or avoid diagnostic testing in younger patients (2). ACD may also be difficult to distinguish from AD due to the high prevalence of AD in children.

While children are exposed to many of the same allergens as adults, their environmental exposures and sensitivities can differ due to age-specific factors (3). Additionally, the limited availability of unaffected skin for testing makes diagnosis in children more challenging. Previously, ACD was thought to be rare in children due to their immature immune systems and limited allergen exposure. However, recent data indicate that its prevalence is comparable to that in adults. (4). Even infants as young as one week old have been reported to develop ACD, underscoring the importance of recognizing and diagnosing the condition in pediatric patients.

ACD is a biphasic, type IV hypersensitivity reaction of the skin. In the sensitization phase, initial exposure to an allergen leads to its processing in regional lymph nodes and the formation of antigen-specific T cells. In the elicitation phase, re-exposure to the allergen triggers an inflammatory response, resulting in erythema, vesiculation, pruritus, and edema (5). Given these challenges, history and physical examination play a crucial role in assessing children for potential ACD. Patch testing remains the gold standard for diagnosis in pediatric patients, despite the difficulties associated with limited unaffected skin available for testing (6).

Children are frequently exposed to various allergens that can lead to ACD. Common pediatric allergens including metals, preservatives, and fragrances are also frequent triggers. Identifying and managing these allergens through patch testing is essential for effective prevention and treatment (7).

In our study, we aimed to evaluate the ESS (European Standard Series) patch test results applied with the preliminary diagnosis of ACD in the childhood age group and their compatibility with clinical findings.

MATERIAL and METHODS

Study Design and Population

This retrospective study included children aged 2 to 18 years who were evaluated at the Pediatric Allergy and Im-

munology Clinic for suspicion of ACD between April 2023 and December 2024. The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee (TABED 1-25-1103).

Data Collection

Medical history and demographic information, including age, sex, patient history, and family history of allergic diseases, were obtained from hospital records. The presence of AD, asthma, and allergic rhinitis was documented. AD was diagnosed based on the Hanifin and Rajka criteria (8).

Laboratory and Allergy Testing

Laboratory examinations, including complete blood count and serum total IgE levels if available, as well as skin prick test results if performed, were recorded. The skin prick test included aeroallergens such as house dust mites, cockroaches, animal hair, mixed grasses, and tree pollens. The tests that had been performed were included in the analysis.

Patch Testing Procedure

All patients were tested using the ESS test, which includes 30 allergens (Chemotechnique Diagnostics, Malmö, Sweden), and the IQ-Chamber test material (Chemotechnique IQ Chamber®; Chemotechnique Diagnostics). Patch testing was not performed on patients receiving systemic corticosteroids or other immunosuppressive treatments. These medications were discontinued at least one month before the procedure. Topical corticosteroids were discontinued at the test site at least seven days before the test. Patch tests were applied to the patients' backs, and caregivers provided written informed consent. During the three-day test period, patients were advised to avoid antihistamines and corticosteroid-containing creams (6).

Patch Test Evaluation

The patches were removed after 48 hours, and the initial reading was conducted after a 15–20-minute waiting period. The results were evaluated using the standard scoring systems of the International and European Contact Dermatitis Research Groups (ICDRG and ECDRG)(9). The presence of erythema, indurations, and small vesicles was considered a positive test result. If no reaction was observed, it was deemed a negative result. Patients were re-evaluated at 72 hours.

Statistical Analysis

SPSS 25 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY) was used for statistical analyses. Descriptive data are presented as numbers and percentages for categorical data, mean \pm standard deviation (SD) for normally distributed continuous data, and as median and interquartile range (IQR) for non-normally distributed continuous data. The Chi-square test was used to compare nominal variables.

Univariate logistic regression analysis was performed to evaluate the association between independent variables and the outcome variable. Results of the logistic regres-

sion analysis are presented as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

RESULTS

This study included a total of 99 patients suspected of having ACD, with a median age of 14 years (IQR: 9-16). The demographic and laboratory characteristics, such as eosinophil count, white blood cell count, and IgE levels, are summarized. Patch test results revealed that 58 patients (58.6%) tested positive for at least one allergen (see Table I for details).

Table I. Demographic, Clinical, and Hematologic Characteristics of Contact Dermatitis Patients

	Median (IQR)	
Age (Year)	14 (9–16)	
Absolute Eosinophil Count (cells/ μ L)	150 (105–310)	
Eosinophil Count (%)	2.20 (1.30–4.20)	
White Blood Cell Count (cells/ μ L)	7320 (6357.5–9110)	
Total IgE Level (UI/mL)	75.30 (15.85–400.2)	
Clinical Characteristic	Count (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender Distribution		
Female	61	61
Lesion Location		
Hand	44	44
Face	18	18
Trunk	15	15
Foot/Leg	8	8
Arm	12	12
Scalp	2	2.0
History of Atopic Dermatitis	34	34
Additional Allergic Disease (Asthma, Allergic Rhinitis, Atopic Dermatitis etc.)	50	50
Skin Prick Test Aeroallergen Positivity		
Positive	28	28
Specific IgE Aeroallergen Positivity		
Positive	24	24
Number of Positive Allergens	Number of Patients (n)	Percentage (%)
Only 1 Allergen	19	32.8
2 Allergens	20	34.5
3 Allergens	8	13.8
4 Allergens	9	15.5
5 Allergens	2	3.4
Total	58	100

Among them, the most commonly affected body site was the hand (44.0%), followed by the face (18.0%), trunk (15.0%), and arm (12.0%). Less frequently affected areas included the foot/leg (8.0%) and scalp (2.0%). The most commonly affected site was the hands, with clinically relevant sensitization observed in 15 cases; in 9 of these, the eczema was associated with direct contact with metals, while in 2 cases, hand eczema was linked to exposure to p-phenylenediamine-containing dyes. Analyzing allergic disease prevalence, 50.5% had at least one diagnosed allergic disease as seen in Table I. The total frequency of allergic conditions among the patients was as follows: atopic dermatitis (34.4%), allergic rhinitis (16.2%), and asthma (12.1%). Skin prick test results showed that allergic sensitization was detected in 28% of the patients. The most common sensitization was to pollen, observed in 22.2% of the patients, followed by cat and/or dog allergens in 8.1%, dust mites in 6.1%, and mold in 1.0%.

Patch test positivity was detected in 36/61 females (59%) and 22/38 males (57.9%), with no statistically significant difference between genders ($p=0.912$). Among the 99 patients evaluated in the study, 58 exhibited at least one positive patch test reaction. Of these, 32 patients (55.1%) demonstrated clinically relevant sensitizations, defined by a consistent relationship between the identified allergen, the anatomical site of the lesions, and the documented contact history. These clinically meaningful associations are detailed in Table II.

Allergens were categorized based on their types, with metals comprising the largest proportion at 26.8% of the total positive reactions. Within the metals group, Nickel sulfate (11.8%) was the most frequently detected, followed by Cobalt chloride (5.2%) and Potassium dichromate (2.0%). The Preservatives group accounted for 24% of the reactions, with Methylchloroisothiazolinone (5.2%), Methylisothiazolinone + Methylchloroisothiazolinone (4.6%) being the most common. Fragrances were responsible for 12% of allergic reactions, with Fragrance mix II (4.6%) and Fragrance mix I (3.3%) being the most common allergens. The Medicaments/Excipients group accounted for 5.5% of reactions, with Neomycin sulfate (2.0%) as the most frequently detected allergen. In the Rubber Additives group (2.8%), Thiuram mix, N-isopropyl-N'-phenyl-4-phenylenediamine, and Mercapto mix each accounted for 0.7%. Resins and Glues (1.8%) had Colophony and Epoxy resin as the primary allergens, each contributing 0.7%. Finally, the Others group, which accounted for 25.9% of reactions, was dominated by Propolis (13.1%), Other allergens with lower frequencies are detailed in Table III.

Patch test positivity was not significantly associated with gender ($p=0.913$), presence of atopic dermatitis ($p=0.376$), age categories (under 12 years and 12 years or older) ($p=0.221$), or presence of other allergic diseases ($p=0.776$). However, a statistically significant difference was found in symptom duration between patients with and without patch test positivity ($p=0.037$). Patients with a

Table II. Allergen Categories, Clinical Presentations, and Associated Positive Patch Test Result

Category	Description	Number of Patients	Associated Positive Allergens
Metals	Eczema or rash, often triggered by contact with metals	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nickel (n=14) - Nickel + Cobalt (n=2) - Potassium dichromate + Cobalt (n=1) - Cobalt (n=2) - Potassium dichromate + Cobalt + Nickel (n=1)
Fragrances	Rash associated with perfumes	2	- Fragrance mix I - Lanolin alcohol
Hair Dye	Rash following hair dye	3	- Para-phenylenediamine (PPD)
Preservatives	Rash following use of creams or exposure to automotive batteries	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methylisothiazolinone (MI) and Methylchloroisothiazolinone (MCI) (n=3) - Sesquiterpene lactone mix (n=1) - Formaldehyde (n=1)
Textile Dye	Rash associated with socks	1	- Textile dye mix
Rubber Additives	Hand rash due to rubber contact	1	- Thiuram mix

Table III. Patch Test Results

Group	Allergen Name	Count	Percentage (%)
Metals (27.1%)	Nickel sulfate	18	16.8
	Cobalt chloride	8	7.5
	Potassium dichromate	3	2.8
Preservatives (24.2%)	Methyldibromo glutaronitrile	8	7.5
	Methylisothiazolinone + Methylchloroisothiazolinone	7	6.5
	Formaldehyde	4	3.7
	Methylisothiazolinone (0.2%)	4	3.7
	Paraben mix	2	1.9
	Quaternium-15	1	0.9
Fragrances (12.1%)	Fragrance mix II	7	6.5
	Fragrance mix I	5	4.7
	Myroxylon Pereirae resin (Peru balsam)	1	0.9
Medicaments/Excipients (5.5%)	Neomycin sulfate	3	2.8
	Benzocaine	1	0.9
	Lanolin alcohols	1	0.9
	Tixocortol-21-pivalate	1	0.9
Rubber Additives (2.7%)	Thiuram mix	1	0.9
	N-isopropyl-N'-phenyl-4-phenylenediamine	1	0.9
	Mercapto mix	1	0.9
Resins and Glues (1.8%)	Colophony	1	0.9
	Epoxy resin	1	0.9
Others (26.2%)	Propolis	20	18.7
	p-Phenylenediamine	3	2.8
	Sesquiterpene lactone mix	2	1.9
	Textile dye mix	3	2.8
Total		107	100.0

positive patch test had a shorter mean symptom duration (9.3 months) compared to those with a negative test (14.7 months). No significant associations were found in the risk factor analysis for patch test positivity, including gender, age (≥ 12 years), presence of allergic diseases, presence of atopic dermatitis, and symptom duration (≥ 12 months).

DISCUSSION

In this study, we evaluated 99 patients with suspected allergic contact dermatitis (ACD), focusing on the demographic characteristics, sensitization patterns, and potential associations with allergic diseases. Patch test positivity was detected in 58 patients (58.6%), among whom 32 (55.1%) had clinically relevant sensitizations, defined by a

consistent correlation between the allergen identified, the anatomical distribution of lesions, and the documented exposure history. When compared with the literature, Boonchai and Lamtharachai reported only the sensitization rates in their study, without further evaluation of clinical relevance (10). Similarly, Pesqué et al. identified occupational exposure in 1% of 513 pediatric patients, but did not explore any association between sensitization and atopy (11). Kalay Yildizhan and Boyvat also reported sensitizations in children, yet atopic status was not evaluated in their analysis (12). In contrast, Lazarov. reported positive patch test results in 937 patients, with clinical relevance determined in 68.4% of the cases (13). No statistically significant difference in sensitization rates was observed between the genders. Similarly, Lazarov. conducted a study on both pediat-

ric and adult patients, reporting that 937 out of 2,156 individuals (43.5%) had one or more positive allergic patch test reactions (13). In the study by Andre et al., the majority of participants were female (63.8%), and 160 children (43.6%) exhibited at least one positive patch test result (14). Bel-loni Fortina et al. analyzed data from 6,708 patients, finding that 2,476 (36.9%) had at least one positive reaction to the EBS series. They also reported no significant difference in patch test positivity between genders, although a higher number of female patients were tested (15). Similarly, Acer et al. reported a comparable positivity rate of 57.8% in their study of 135 adult patients, with no significant gender difference in reactions to at least one allergen (16). Finally, in a study focusing on children, Kalay Yıldızhan and Boyvat. found that 49 patients (30.6%) had at least one positive patch test reaction (12).

The most common primary site of dermatitis in our study was the hands (n=44, 44%), followed by the face/head/neck region (n=18, 18%), the trunk (n=15, 15%), and the arms (n=12, 12 %). Similarly, Acer et al. reported that dermatitis most frequently affected the hands (43.7%), followed by the trunk (27.4%) and the face (19.3%) (16). In a study by Zug et al., pediatric ACD was most commonly observed on the face, in a generalized scattered distribution pattern, and on the extremities (arms and legs) (17). Likewise, Lazarov. identified the hands (30.7%), face and neck (23.9%), and extremities (11.3%) as the most frequently affected sites (13). In a study involving adult patients by Koca et al. the localization of dermatitis was found to be predominantly on the hands (69.7%), followed by the feet (22.8%), face (19.4%), and body (20.4%). Notably, 499 patients (42.7%) had only hand involvement (18). These findings underscore the variation in dermatitis localization across different studies, with hands consistently emerging as the most commonly affected site (11).

The total frequency of allergic conditions among the patients was as follows: AD (34.4%), allergic rhinitis (16.2%), and asthma (12.1%). Similarly, Kalay Yıldızhan and Boyvat, reported that 68 patients (42.5%) had a history of atopy, with AD diagnosed in 36 patients (22.5%) (12). Lazarov found that atopy and asthma were present in 472 patients (21.9%), including 205 (9.5%) with AD, 237 (11.0%) with mucosal atopy and/or asthma, and 30 (1.4%) with both conditions (13). In the study by Koca et al., 291 (24.9%) of the 1169 patients tested were designated as “atopic”. Among the atopic patients, 103 had allergic rhinitis (8.8%), 44 had asthma (3.8%), and 48 had AD (4.1%)(18).

Allergens were categorized by type, with metals being the most common and accounting for 26.8% of positive reactions, followed by preservatives (24.0%), and others (25.9%). Among metal allergens, nickel sulfate (11.8%), cobalt chloride (5.2%), and potassium dichromate (2.0%) were the most frequently detected. Similarly, Acer et al. identified the most common allergens as nickel sulfate (27.4%), potassium dichromate (14.8%), cobalt chloride (11.9%), and textile dye mix (8.1%) (16). According to Bel-loni Fortina et al., the most common allergens were nickel sulfate (16.7%), cobalt chloride (7.5%), potassium dichromate (5.2%), and neomycin sulfate (3.2%) (15). Lazarov et al. reported nickel sulfate (13.9%) as the most frequent contact allergen, followed by fragrance mix (7.1%), potassium dichromate (3.8%), and Balsam of Peru (3.6%) (13). Kalay Yıldızhan and Boyvat, found that metals were the most prevalent allergen group (13.8%), followed by preservatives (10%), dyes (6.2%), and fragrances (4.4%)(12). Their five most common allergens were nickel sulfate (10.6%), Methylchloroisothiazolinone (MCI) / Methylisothiazolinone (MI) (8.1%), cobalt chloride (5.6%), p-phenylenediamine (PPD) (5%), and MI (3.5%). In our study, the most frequently detected allergen was propolis, and there are also studies in the literature reporting propolis as the most common allergen (19). We believe the high prevalence of propolis allergy in our study is due to its widespread use in natural products, particularly in oral health products, honey-based formulations, and skincare products. Our study supports the existing literature by demonstrating that metals and preservatives are the most frequent triggers of ACD (11, 20).

Limitations

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, its retrospective design inherently restricts the ability to establish causal relationships and may not account for all potential variables influencing sensitization rates. Second, the absence of a detailed exposure history limited our capacity to identify specific sources of allergen exposure. This is particularly relevant for substances like propolis, which may be present in a variety of health-related products, including dietary supplements and topical formulations, and these were not systematically recorded. Finally, the inability to pinpoint precise sources of allergen exposure may have contributed to the high frequency of propolis sensitization observed in our cohort. These limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. Future prospective studies with

more rigorous tracking of exposure history and allergen sources are warranted to address these gaps.

CONCLUSION

Studies have shown that ACD occurs in the pediatric age group at rates similar to those observed in adults. Infants and young children are exposed to a wide range of foreign substances through various sources, including diet, clothing, toys, and hygiene products, as they grow. This continuous exposure increases the risk of developing allergic sensitization. Given its impact on the quality of life and potential chronicity, ACD represents a significant health concern in the pediatric population, highlighting the need for early diagnosis and preventive measures.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge the invaluable assistance of the nursing staff in performing the patch tests.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Funding

The authors received no funding for this research.

Author Contributions

Concept: Zeynep Şengül Emeksiz, Emine Dibek Mısırlıoğlu, Design: Ahmet Selmanoğlu, Zeynep Şengül Emeksiz, Emine Dibek Mısırlıoğlu, Data collection or processing: Ahmet Selmanoğlu, Aslı Kuzu Kusaklı, Funda Aytekin Güvenir, Analysis or Interpretation: Ahmet Selmanoğlu, Aslı Kuzu Kusaklı, Zeynep Şengül Emeksiz, Literature search: Ahmet Selmanoğlu, Aslı Kuzu Kusaklı, Funda Aytekin Güvenir, Zeynep Şengül Emeksiz, Writing: Ahmet Selmanoğlu, Aslı Kuzu Kusaklı, Funda Aytekin Güvenir, Zeynep Şengül Emeksiz, Emine Dibek Mısırlıoğlu, Approval: Ahmet Selmanoğlu, Aslı Kuzu Kusaklı, Funda Aytekin Güvenir, Zeynep Şengül Emeksiz, Emine Dibek Mısırlıoğlu,

REFERENCES

- Murphy PB, Atwater AR, Mueller M. Allergic contact dermatitis. 2018.
- Sung CT, McGowan MA, Jacob SE. Allergic Contact Dermatitis Evaluation: Strategies for the Preschooler. *Curr Allergy Asthma Rep.* 2018;18(10):49.
- Murrison LB, Brandt EB, Myers JB, Hershey GKK. Environmental exposures and mechanisms in allergy and asthma development. *J Clin Invest.* 2019;129(4):1504-15.
- Zug KA, McGinley-Smith D, Warshaw EM, Taylor JS, Rietschel RL, Maibach HI, et al. Contact allergy in children referred for patch testing: North American Contact Dermatitis Group data, 2001-2004. *Archives of Dermatology.* 2008;144(10):1329-36.
- Neale H, Garza-Mayers AC, Tam I, Yu J. Pediatric allergic contact dermatitis. Part I: Clinical features and common contact allergens in children. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology.* 2021;84(2):235-44.
- de Waard-van der Spek FB, Darsow U, Mortz CG, Orton D, Worm M, Muraro A, et al. EAACI position paper for practical patch testing in allergic contact dermatitis in children. *Pediatric Allergy and Immunology.* 2015;26(7):598-606.
- Tam I, Yu J. Pediatric contact dermatitis: what's new. *Current Opinion in Pediatrics.* 2020;32(4):524-30.
- Hanifin JM, Rajka G. Diagnostic features of atopic dermatitis. *Acta Dermatol Venereol (Stockh).* 1980;92:44-7.
- Johansen JD, Aalto-Korte K, Agner T, Andersen KE, Bircher A, Bruze M, et al. European Society of Contact Dermatitis guideline for diagnostic patch testing—recommendations on best practice. *Contact Dermatitis.* 2015;73(4):195-221.
- Boonchai W, Lamtharachai P. Risk factors for common contact allergens and patch test results using a modified European baseline series in patients tested during between 2000 and 2009 at Siriraj Hospital. *Asian Pacific Journal of Allergy and Immunology.* 2014;32(1):60-5.
- Pesqué D, Planella-Fontanillas N, Borrego L, Sanz-Sánchez T, Zaragoza-Ninet V, Serra-Baldrich E, et al. Patch test results to the Spanish baseline patch test series according to age groups: A multicentric prospective study from 2019 to 2023. *Contact Dermatitis.* 2025;92(2):120-30.
- Kalay Yildizhan I, Boyvat A. The Contact Sensitivity of Turkish Children and Adolescents to European Baseline Series Allergens between 2013 and 2023. *Dermatol Pract Concept.* 2024;14(2):e2024151.
- Lazarov A. European Standard Series patch test results from a contact dermatitis clinic in Israel during the 7-year period from 1998 to 2004. *Contact Dermatitis.* 2006;55(2):73-6.
- Andre N, Usher A, Ofri M, Horev A. Exploring the relationship between allergic contact dermatitis and atopic dermatitis in children: Insights from a retrospective patch testing analysis. *International Journal of Dermatology.* 2024;63(6):795-8.
- Belloni Fortina A, Cooper SM, Spiewak R, Fontana E, Schnuch A, Uter W, et al. Patch test results in children and adolescents across Europe. Analysis of the ESSCA Network 2002-2010. *Pediatric Allergy and Immunology.* 2015;26(5):446-55.
- Acer E, Erdogan HK, Batan T, Saracoglu ZN. European standard series patch test results in contact dermatitis patients in a tertiary care hospital. *Şişli Etfal Hastanesi Tip Bülteni.* 2020;54(2):206-10.
- Zug KA, Warshaw EM, Fowler Jr JF, Maibach HI, Belsito DL, Pratt MD, et al. Patch-test results of the North American contact dermatitis group 2005-2006. *DERM.* 2009;20(3):149-60.
- Koca R, Kocaturk E, Savk E, Baskan EB, Aydin F, Yalcin B, et al. Patch test results to European baseline series in Turkey: A prospective and multicenter study. *Dermatitis.* 2021;32(6):397-405.

19. Pixley JN, Kontzias C, Tao RE, Massey L, Mcpeek K, Neighbors K, Srivastava R, Feldman SR, Burkhart C. A Retrospective Study of Pediatric Allergic Contact Dermatitis from 2017-2022. *Dermatol Ther (Heidelb)*. 2025;15(2):445-52.
20. Isufi D, Jensen MB, Kursawe Larsen C, Alinaghi F, Schwensen JFB, Johansen JD. Allergens Responsible for Contact Allergy in Children From 2010 to 2024: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Contact Dermatitis*. 2025;92(5):327-43.