

Our findings highlight associations of VLS with elevated body mass index, cholecystectomy, and statin usage. Increased adipose tissue is a well-studied orchestrator of inflammation and fibrosis.^{2,3} Similarly, cholecystectomy may have downstream metabolic consequences, including disruption of glucose homeostasis, cholesterol efflux, and energy expenditure.⁴ The metabolic role of statins may be complex, as statins have been associated with glucose dysregulation.⁵ Increased statin usage among VLS patients suggests the presence of underlying dyslipidemia and metabolic dysregulation.

Underlying metabolic dysregulation in the setting of VLS may also be related to chronic inflammation. Chronic inflammatory skin conditions, including lichen planus and psoriasis, are linked to higher risks for metabolic disease due to key roles of inflammation in dyslipidemia.^{2,3} Chronic inflammation and iatrogenic events, including cholecystectomy and medications affecting the insulin axis, may underlie metabolic dysregulation in VLS patients.

Yen Luu, BA,^a An-Lin Cheng, PhD,^b and Colleen Reisz, MD^a

From the Department of Dermatology, University of Missouri – Kansas City School of Medicine, Kansas City, Missouri^a; and Department of Biostatistics and Health Informatics, University of Missouri – Kansas City School of Medicine, Kansas City, Missouri.^b

Funding sources: None.

IRB approval status: Reviewed and approved by the institute's IRB.

Patient consent: Informed written consent was obtained from all patients and controls.

Key words: cholecystectomy; chronic inflammation; comorbid; lichen sclerosus; menopause; metabolic dysfunction; statins; vulvar lichen sclerosus.

Reprints not available from the authors.

Correspondence to: Yen Luu, BA, Department of Dermatology, University of Missouri - Kansas City School of Medicine, 2411 Holmes St, Kansas City, MO 64108

E-mail: ytlx9d@umsystem.edu

Conflicts of interest

None disclosed.

REFERENCES

1. Fan R, Leasure AC, Maisha FI, Little AJ, Cohen JM. Depression and anxiety in patients with lichen sclerosus. *JAMA Dermatol.*

2022;158(8):953-954. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamadermatol.2022.1964>

2. Ying J, Xiang W, Qiu Y, Zeng X. Risk of metabolic syndrome in patients with lichen planus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(8):e0238005. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238005>
3. Gisondi P, Fostini AC, Fossà I, Girolomoni G, Targher G. Psoriasis and the metabolic syndrome. *Clin Dermatol.* 2018; 36(1):21-28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clindermatol.2017.09.005>
4. Qi L, Tian Y, Chen Y. Gall bladder: the metabolic orchestrator. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev.* 2019;35(5):e3140. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dmrr.3140>
5. Slomski A. Statin use is associated with diabetes progression. *JAMA.* 2021;326(21):2120. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.21431>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2023.01.023>

Trajectories and prognosis after discontinuation of biologics due to remission in psoriasis: A nationwide cohort study



To the Editor: Patients with and dermatologists treating psoriasis usually strive for complete skin clearance, yet some patients prefer being off treatment. However, the prognosis after treatment discontinuation following remission is not well characterized. We investigated epidemiological characteristics and disease markers during the first 2 years following cessation of biologics due to remission.

DERMBIO contains detailed information on all Danish psoriasis patients treated with biologics including cause of discontinuation.¹ Data on comorbidity and concurrent treatment (eg, topical therapy) were obtained through individual-level linkage across nationwide registries.^{2,3} Adults treated with biologics between January 1, 2007, and December 31, 2016, were included and followed for 24 months. In DERMBIO, physicians state the reason for discontinuation through predefined options (eg, “Lack of efficacy”, “Side effects”, or “Remission”). The choice of “remission” is made by the dermatologist and may thus be chosen even with residual plaques. We defined remission as discontinuation with “remission” stated as reason and a Psoriasis Area and Severity Index (PASI) <3 at time of cessation.

Characteristics were reported as frequencies and percentages or medians and interquartile ranges (IQRs). The proportions of patients to restart biologics or initiate nonbiologic systemics (including phototherapy) were reported and visualized with 95% confidence intervals. Kaplan–Meier curves

Table I. Patient characteristics

	Discontinued due to remission	Discontinued due to remission (PASI = 0)	Discontinued due to remission (PASI >0)	Not discontinued due to remission
Treatment series, <i>n</i>	40	24	16	3804
Men, <i>n</i> (%)	21 (53)	12 (50)	9 (56)	2305 (61)
Treatment duration in d, median (IQR)	681 (336-1419)	681 (336-1419)	646 (345-1500)	812 (259, 1791)
Age at diagnosis, median (IQR), y	29.0 (15.0-44.0)	32.5 (18.5-44.0)	17.0 (13.0-43.0)	21.0 (14.0, 34.0)
Age at prescription, median (IQR), y	43.0 (30.8-58.3)	48.5 (38.0-62.3)	34.0 (23.8-46.5)	46.0 (36.0-56.0)
Number of previous biologics, median (IQR)	0.0 (0.0-1.0)	0.0 (0.0-1.0)	0.0 (0.0-1.0)	0.0 (0.0-1.0)
Baseline PASI, median (IQR)	5.3 (2.0-14.3)	4.3 (1.8-10.0)	10.0 (3.0-15.0)	8.6 (3.7-13.4)
Baseline DLQI, median (IQR)	10.0 (2.0-14.0)	5.0 (0.0-10.5)	14.0 (5.0-18.0)	10.0 (4.0-16.0)
Last PASI, median (IQR)	0.0 (0.0-1.2)	0.0 (0.0-0.0)	1.5 (0.90-2.0)	2.0 (0.0-6.6)
Last DLQI, median (IQR)	0.0 (0.0-2.5)	0.0 (0.0-0.0)	1.0 (0.0-4.0)	2.0 (0.0-7.0)
Weight [kg], median (IQR)	80.0 (70.5-87.8)	75.0 (67.5-79.0)	86.0 (80.0-102.0)	90.0 (75.0-103.0)
BMI [kg/m ²], median (IQR)	25.8 (25.0-31.6)	25.7 (25.0-30.3)	26.9 (25.1-35.9)	28.2 (24.6-33.2)
PsA, <i>n</i> (%)	7 (18)	≤6 (≤25)	<3 (<13)	1002 (26)
Diabetes, <i>n</i> (%)	5 (13)	≤5 (≤21)	<3 (<13)	225 (6)
0 previously failed biologic treatments, <i>n</i> (%)	24 (60)	14 (58)	10 (63)	2011 (53)
1 previously failed biologic treatment, <i>n</i> (%)	9 (23)	6 (25)	3 (19)	957 (25)
2+ previously failed biologic treatments, <i>n</i> (%)	7 (18)	4 (17)	3 (19)	836 (22)
Drug (cytokine target), <i>n</i> (%)				
TNF-alpha inhibitor	28 (70)	18 (75)	10 (63)	2349 (62)
IL-12/23 inhibitor	12 (30)	6 (25)	6 (38)	1131 (30)
IL-17 inhibitor	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	251 (6.6)
Other	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	73 (1.9)
Time with PASI = 0 prior to discontinuation, <i>n</i> (%)				
Only last visit	NA	10 (42)	NA	NA
<6 mo	NA	5 (21)	NA	NA
6-12 mo	NA	3 (13)	NA	NA
>12 mo	NA	6 (25)	NA	NA

BMI, Body mass index; DLQI, Dermatology Life Quality Index; IL, interleukin; IQR, interquartile range; NA, not applicable; PASI, Psoriasis Area and Severity Index; PsA, psoriatic arthritis; TNF-alpha, tumor necrosis factor alpha.

displayed time from remission to initiation of a new treatment (Supplementary Material, available via Mendeley at <https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/9trkp6r3n4/1>). We used SAS v9.4 (SAS Institute Inc) and Python 3.7.4.

In total, 40 (1%) of 3844 treatment series were discontinued due to remission and were compared to the rest of the 3804 (99%) treatment series. Upon treatment discontinuation, PASI = 0 was achieved in 24 (60.0%) treatment series. The median Dermatology Life Quality Index at remission was 0 for both overall and patients with PASI = 0, while it was 1 for patients with PASI >0. Most patients were men (53 %) and bio-naïve (60%). The median (IQR) age at diagnosis and prescription of treatment was 29.0 years (15.0, 44.0) and 43.0 years (30.8, 58.3), respectively. Seven (18%) patients were diagnosed with psoriatic arthritis and 5 (13%) patients had concomitant diabetes (Table I).

Two years after discontinuation, 17 (43%) remained in remission or initiated treatment with topical therapy only. Among the patients achieving PASI = 0 at discontinuation, 12 (50%) were in remission or managed their symptoms with topical therapy for a minimum of 2 years. Among patients achieving remission with PASI >0, 5 (31%) remained in remission or were treated with topical therapy after 2 years (Table II).

Patients were most likely to initiate topical treatment compared to systemics/biologics.

Of the 18 patients restarting biologics, 13 initiated the same drug as they had previously discontinued. The median (IQR) duration of treatment in the patients who reinitiated the same drug was 768 (265-1200) days, suggesting that patients who stop biologic treatment because of a remission have a low risk of loss of effect on reinitiating that treatment.

Table II. Proportion (95% CI) of patients that have restarted treatment (any treatment, topicals only, or systemic treatment including biologics) at different time points, after biologics were stopped due to remission

	Any	Topicals	Systemics
Overall			
Within 6 mo	65.0% (49.5%-77.9%)	35.0% (22.1%-50.5%)	30.0% (18.1%-45.4%)
Within 12 mo	82.5% (68.1%-91.3%)	32.5% (20.1%-48.0%)	50.0% (35.2%-64.8%)
Within 18 mo	85.0% (70.9%-92.9%)	27.5% (16.1%-42.8%)	57.5% (42.2%-71.5%)
Within 24 mo	85.0% (70.9%-92.9%)	27.5% (16.1%-42.8%)	57.5% (42.2%-71.5%)
PASI = 0 at discontinuation			
Within 6 mo	62.5% (42.7%-78.8%)	37.5% (21.2%-57.3%)	25.0% (12.0%-44.9%)
Within 12 mo	79.2% (59.5%-90.8%)	33.3% (18.0%-53.3%)	45.8% (27.9%-64.9%)
Within 18 mo	83.3% (64.1%-93.3%)	33.3% (18.0%-53.3%)	50.0% (31.4%-68.6%)
Within 24 mo	83.3% (64.1%-93.3%)	33.3% (18.0%-53.3%)	50.0% (31.4%-68.6%)
PASI >0 at discontinuation			
Within 6 mo	68.8% (44.4%-85.8%)	31.3% (14.2%-55.6%)	37.5% (18.5%-61.4%)
Within 12 mo	87.5% (64.0%-96.5%)	31.3% (14.2%-55.6%)	56.3% (33.2%-76.9%)
Within 18 mo	87.5% (64.0%-96.5%)	18.8% (7.0%-43.0%)	68.8% (44.4%-85.8%)
Within 24 mo	87.5% (64.0%-96.5%)	18.8% (7.0%-43.0%)	68.8% (44.4%-85.8%)

PASI, Psoriasis Area and Severity Index.

Only a small fraction of patients discontinued their treatment due to remission, which limits this study. More data and further investigations into this topic are relevant to fully illuminate and understand the prognosis after remission.

In conclusion, these results suggest the tantalizing possibility that some patients, especially those who achieved complete skin clearance, can discontinue their biologic treatment and still maintain long-term control of their disease.

We acknowledge the substantial contribution of the academic hospitals and private clinics and their physicians that report data to DERMBIO.

Mia-Louise Nielsen, MSc,^a David Thein, MD,^a Mads Kirchhainer Rasmussen, MD, PhD,^{b,c} Trine Bertelsen, MD,^{b,c} Tomas Norman Dam, MD, PhD,^{b,d} Lone Skov, MD, PhD, DMSc,^{b,e} Lars Erik Bryld, MD, PhD,^{b,f} Jashin J. Wu, MD,^g Simon Francis Thomsen, MD, PhD, DMSc,^a Jacob P. Thyssen, MD, PhD, DMSc,^a and Alexander Egeberg, MD, PhD, DMSc^{a,b,b}

From the Department of Dermatology, Copenhagen University Hospital - Bispebjerg, Copenhagen, Denmark^a; DERMBIO, Copenhagen, Denmark^b; Department of Dermatology, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark^c; Dermatology Clinic, Nykøbing Falster, Denmark^d; Department of Dermatology and Allergy, Herlev and Gentofte Hospital, Hellerup, Denmark^e; Department of Dermatology, Zealand University Hospital, Roskilde, Denmark^f; Department of Dermatology, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine,

Miami, Florida^g; and Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.^b

Funding sources: None.

IRB approval status: Not applicable.

Key words: biologics; PASI; psoriasis; remission; skin clearance; systemics; topicals; treatment discontinuation.

Reprints not available from the authors.

Correspondence to: Mia-Louise Nielsen, MSc, Department of Dermatology, Bispebjerg Hospital, University of Copenhagen, Bispebjerg Bakke 23, 2400, Copenhagen, Denmark

E-mail: mia-louise.nielsen@regionnb.dk

Conflicts of interest

Dr Thein has received funding from Ebba Celinders Legat and Else og Mogens Wedell-Wedellsborgs Fond. With no relation to the present manuscript Dr Rasmussen has been a speaker or has served on advisory boards for AbbVie, LEO Pharma, Novartis, UCB Pharma, and Janssen Pharmaceuticals; and has been an investigator for UCB Pharma and Novartis. With no relation to the present manuscript Dr Bertelsen has received research funding from Novartis, the Danish National Psoriasis Foundation, The A.P Moller foundation, and the Kgl Hofbundtmager Aage Bang Foundation, and received educational grants from Pfizer and Abbvie, and has been a paid speaker for Eli Lilly and Leo Pharma. Dr Skov has been a paid speaker for AbbVie, Eli Lilly, Pfizer, Novartis, Janssen and LEO Pharma, and has been a consultant or has served on Advisory Boards with AbbVie, Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Novartis, Eli Lilly, Boehringer Ingelheim, LEO Pharma, Almirall, Bristol-Myers Squibb, UCB and Sanofi. She has

served as an investigator for AbbVie, Sanofi, Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Boehringer Ingelheim, Galderma, Eli Lilly, Novartis, Regeneron, and LEO Pharma, and has received research funding from Novartis, Sanofi, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Janssen Pharmaceuticals, LEO Pharma and Leo Foundation. Dr Bryld has received an educational grant from Janssen Pharmaceuticals. Dr Wu is or has been an investigator, consultant, or speaker for AbbVie, Ammirall, Amgen, Arcutis, Aristeia Therapeutics, Bausch Health, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Dermavant, DermTech, Dr Reddy's Laboratories, Eli Lilly, EPI Health, Galderma, Janssen, LEO Pharma, Mindera, Novartis, Pfizer, Regeneron, Samsung Bioepis, Sanofi Genzyme, Solius, Sun Pharmaceutical, UCB, and Zerigo Health. With no relation to the present manuscript Dr Thomsen has been a speaker or has served on advisory boards for Sanofi, AbbVie, LEO Pharma, Pfizer, Eli Lilly and Company, Novartis, UCB Pharma, Union Therapeutics, Ammirall, and Janssen Pharmaceuticals; has received research support from Sanofi, AbbVie, LEO Pharma, Novartis, UCB Pharma, and Janssen Pharmaceuticals; and has been an investigator for Sanofi, Regeneron, AbbVie, CSL, AstraZeneca, LEO Pharma, Boehringer Ingelheim, Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Novartis and Pfizer. With no relation to the present manuscript Dr Thyssen is an advisor for AbbVie, Ammirall, Arena Pharmaceuticals, Coloplast, OM Pharma, Aslan Pharmaceuticals, Union Therapeutics, Eli Lilly & Co, LEO Pharma, Pfizer, Regeneron, and Sanofi-Genzyme; a speaker for AbbVie, Ammirall, Eli Lilly & Co, LEO Pharma, Pfizer, Regeneron, and Sanofi-Genzyme; and received research grants from Pfizer, Regeneron, and Sanofi-Genzyme. With no relation to the present manuscript Dr Egeberg has received research funding from Pfizer, Eli Lilly, Novartis, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Boehringer Ingelheim, AbbVie, Janssen Pharmaceuticals, the Danish National Psoriasis Foundation, the Simon Spies Foundation, and the Kgl Hofbundtmager Aage Bang Foundation; and honoraria as consultant and/or speaker from AbbVie, Ammirall, Leo Pharma, Zuellig Pharma Ltd, Galápagos NV, Sun Pharmaceuticals, Samsung Bioepis Co, Ltd, Pfizer, Eli Lilly and Company, Novartis, Galderma, Dermavant, UCB, Mylan, Bristol-Myers Squibb, McNeil Consumer Healthcare, Horizon Therapeutics, Boehringer Ingelheim, and Janssen Pharmaceuticals. Ms Nielsen, Dr Dam, and Dr Ajeiy have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

REFERENCES

1. Egeberg A, Iversen L, Gniadecki R, et al. Characteristics of patients receiving ustekinumab compared with secukinumab for treatment of moderate-to-severe plaque psoriasis — nationwide results from the DERMBIO registry. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol.* 2017;31:1183-1187.
2. Pottegård A, Schmidt SAJ, Wallach-Kildemoes H, Sorensen HT, Hallas J, Schmidt M. Data resource profile: the Danish National Prescription Registry. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2017;46:798-798f.
3. Schmidt M, Schmidt SAJ, Sandegaard JL, Ehrenstein V, Pedersen L, Sorensen HT. The Danish National Patient Registry:

a review of content, data quality, and research potential. *Clin Epidemiol.* 2015;7:449-490.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2023.01.029>

Personal connections and preference signaling: A cross-sectional analysis of the dermatology residency match during COVID-19



To the Editor: The 2022 National Residency Match Program (NRMP) cycle was the first to allow dermatology applicants to formally connect with their highest-interest programs via preference signaling.¹ Connections with residency programs are linked to dermatology applicant match success,^{2,3} yet limited data exist evaluating preference signaling and connections with residency programs during the virtual era of the COVID-19 pandemic. We assessed connections and preference signaling and compared characteristics of prepandemic (PPA, 2017-2020) and pandemic (PA, 2021-2022) applicants using a cross-sectional analysis of the Texas Seeking Transparency in Application to Residency database.

Texas Seeking Transparency in Application to Residency encompasses voluntary survey response data from 27,298 applicants from 136 U.S. medical schools (2017-2022). Self-reported personal connections between applicants and residency programs included away rotations (in-person/virtual), geographic ties, and preference signaling (2022 only). We compared personal connections and characteristics of dermatology PPA and PA using bivariate models. Associations of preference signaling to receiving interviews and matching were quantified using Stata (StataCorp; Version 17.0).

Between 360 PPA and 273 PA, 538 (85%) were matched and 95 (15%) were unmatched. Matched PA reported more honored clerkships, research experiences, peer-reviewed publications, abstracts, posters, presentations, and leadership experiences relative to matched PPA ($P_{all} < 0.05$, Table 1). Of which, 84% PPA and 87% PA reported at least one personal connection with the program at which they matched. PA reported receiving more interviews from programs at which they had geographic connections to (30% vs 26%; $P = .001$). However, PPA received (8.82 vs 4.68) and attended (8.33 vs 5.50) more interviews overall ($P < .05$).

During the pandemic, 35.2% (96/273) of applicants reported completing virtual away rotations, and 8.33% (8/96) matched at program where they had virtually rotated. In 2022, 137 applicants reported sending a total of 424 preference signals. Among those who matched, 27 (11.5%) signaled