

Incidence and Risk Factor of Allergic Contact Dermatitis to 2-Octyl Cyanoacrylate and n-Butyl Cyanoacrylate Topical Skin Adhesives

Young Hwan Park

Korea University Medical Center

Jeong Seok Choi

Korea University Medical Center

Jung Woo Choi

Korea University Medical Center

Hak Jun Kim (✉ hjunkimos@gmail.com)

Korea University Medical Center

Research Article

Keywords: Allergic reaction, Hypersensitivity, Sutureless repair, Tissue adhesives

Posted Date: August 31st, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-845094/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Scientific Reports on December 1st, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-03319-3>.

Abstract

Although the use of topical skin adhesives has increased as an alternative to conventional skin closure methods, studies on the incidence and risk factors of allergic contact dermatitis (ACD) to topical skin adhesives have been limited. The purpose of this study was to investigate the incidence and risk factors of ACD after the use of 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and n-butyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesives. We retrospectively reviewed 1145 patients (739 patients with 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and 406 patients with n-butyl cyanoacrylate) who underwent skin closure with topical skin adhesives. Variables suspected to correlate with ACD were retrieved from medical records and analyzed to determine risk factors. The incidence of ACD from the use of 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and n-butyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesives was 2.7% and 2.2%, respectively. There was no statistically significant difference in the incidence between the two ingredients. In logistic regression analysis, none of the variables were found to increase the risk of ACD in both 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and n-butyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesives. As ACD occurs without risk factors in 2–3% of patients who used 2-octyl cyanoacrylate or n-butyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesives, clinicians and patients should be aware of these facts before using topical skin adhesives.

Introduction

As inappropriate skin closure can lead to cosmetically unacceptable scars, delayed healing, wound dehiscence, or infection, selection of skin closure method is important for orthopaedic surgeons.^{1–3} Over several decades, skin staples and sutures have been regarded as a common method for skin closure. However, despite their long period of usage, their fundamental shortcomings, such as time-consuming nature, cosmetic issues, and the need for removal are still unresolved.^{4–6} For this reason, topical skin adhesives, which have the advantages of good scar cosmesis, infection prevention, easy skill acquisition, and lack of need for dedicated removal have begun to attract attention.^{7–13}

Liquid 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and n-butyl cyanoacrylate monomers are commonly used ingredients for topical skin adhesives because they polymerize into solid chains upon contact with the wound surface and hold wound edges together.¹⁴ Although 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and n-butyl cyanoacrylate are harmless to most patients, they can act as allergens and cause allergic contact dermatitis (ACD).^{15,16} ACD to topical skin adhesives usually presents as a self-limiting urticarial eruption near the incision site and subsides after proper local management. However, in some patients, it mimics postoperative infection, causes severe local or systemic reactions, and eventually, cosmetic sequelae.¹⁷ Consequently, despite the advantages of topical skin adhesives, many orthopaedic surgeons still hesitate to use them due to unpredictable adverse effects.

To date, ACD to topical skin adhesives has been continuously reported in case reports of sporadic events, but systematic studies on their incidence and risk factors have been limited. Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the incidence of ACD after the use of 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and n-butyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesives and to determine whether there are any risk factors for their occurrence.

Patients And Methods

After approval from the local Ethics Committee of Korea University Guro Hospital (No. 2021GR145), a total of 1145 patients who underwent skin closure with topical skin adhesives in our institution between April 2017 and February 2021 were retrospectively reviewed. As a retrospective study, informed consent was waived by local Ethics Committee of Korea University Guro Hospital. All patients underwent foot and ankle surgeries, which were performed by two orthopaedic surgeons. Topical skin adhesives contained 2-octyl cyanoacrylate (Surgiseal®, Adhezion Biomedical, Wyomissing, PA; Dermabond® Prineo®, Ethicon, Somerville, NJ) or n-butyl cyanoacrylate (LiquiBand®, Advanced Medical Solutions, Winsford, UK). The exclusion criteria included age < 18 years, inflammatory disease (e.g., rheumatoid arthritis or psoriatic arthritis), active infection in the area of incision prior to surgery, follow-up of less than 6 weeks, or history of allergic skin reaction to adhesives or tape. Twenty-two patients were excluded according to the criteria, resulting in the enrollment of 1145 patients in this study (195 patients using Surgiseal®, 544 patients using Dermabond® Prineo®, and 406 patients using LiquiBand®). Based on the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines,¹⁸ all methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations.

After the surgical procedure of each patient, the fascia and subcutaneous layers were closed using 2 – 0 and 3 – 0 synthetic absorbable braided sutures. Topical skin adhesives were applied according to the instruction manual of each product. Surgiseal® and LiquiBand® were applied to two thin layers with a drying time of 30 to 60 seconds between layers to enable polymerization, and Dermabond® Prineo® was applied with the same process to a mesh. After that, a standard absorbent dressing was applied and changed on the second day after surgery.

Patients were followed up between the first and second week after surgery, and surgical wounds were inspected by orthopaedic surgeons. If the patients presented with well-demarcated pruritic eczematous eruption, papules, or vesicles that were localized in the area of skin that came in contact with skin adhesives (Fig. 1),^{17,19} they were referred to a dermatologist for the diagnosis of ACD. Patch tests were not performed unless the lesions exhibited atypical features, or a topical skin adhesive was suspected to be the cause of dermatitis. ACD cases were treated using steroid ointment and oral antihistamines. If a superficial wound infection was suspected, oral antibiotics were administered. For wound dehiscence, adhesive tape was applied to the margins of the wound. None of the patients received systemic steroid therapy or wound revision.

The variables used to determine the risk factors of ACD to topical skin adhesives were retrieved from electronic medical records. As no definite factors related to the development of allergic contact dermatitis to topical skin adhesives are known, the variables that have been suspected to correlate with type IV hypersensitivity were included in the investigation, along with patient characteristics.^{20–22} Two authors independently reviewed the medical records, and in case of any discrepancies between the two on the variables, a final decision was made through a consensus discussion.

Statistical analysis

The difference in the incidence of ACD between ingredients or products was analyzed using the chi-square test. The risk factors for ACD were identified using logistic regression analysis of odds ratios. ACD was considered as a dependent variable, while age, sex, body mass index, diabetes, smoking, asthma, history of atopic dermatitis, history of contact dermatitis, neutrophil count, eosinophil count, and anatomical region were considered as independent variables. Continuous variables were analyzed with simple logistic regression, and categorical variables were analyzed using the chi-square test or Fisher exact test, as appropriate. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS (version 23.0; IBM, Armonk, NY, USA), and significance was set at p -value < 0.05 .

Results

Incidence of allergic contact dermatitis

Of the 1145 patients included in the study, 29 (2.5%) experienced ACD after the use of topical skin adhesive in foot and ankle surgery. Twenty of 739 (2.7%) patients using 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and 9 of 406 (2.2%) patients using n-butyl cyanoacrylate showed ACD. Seven of 195 (3.6%) patients in Surgiseal®, 13 of 544 (2.4%) patients in Dermabond® Prineo®, and 9 of 406 (2.2%) patients in LiquiBand® showed ACD. There was no difference in the incidence of ACD between ingredients or products.

Risk factor for allergic contact dermatitis

None of the variables was found to increase the risk of ACD. Patient demographics are presented in Table 1. In the logistic regression analysis, age, sex, body mass index, diabetes, smoking, asthma, history of atopic dermatitis, history of contact dermatitis, neutrophil count, eosinophil count, and anatomical region did not show any correlation with the occurrence of allergic contact dermatitis (Table 2).

Table 1
Patient demographics.

Variable	2-octyl cyanoacrylate		n-butyl cyanoacrylate	
	Non-ACD (N = 719)	ACD (N = 20)	Non-ACD (N = 397)	ACD (N = 9)
Age, y	46.8 ± 16.2	41.5 ± 18.1	45.0 ± 16.7	37.9 ± 14.2
Sex	334	9	209	5
Male	385	11	188	4
Female				
Diabetes	54	1	28	0
Yes	665	19	369	9
No				
Smoking	135	2	80	1
Yes	584	18	317	8
No				
Asthma	5	0	1	0
Yes	714	20	398	9
No				
History atopic dermatitis	11	0	5	0
Yes	708	20	396	9
No				
History of allergies ^a	36	1	24	1
Yea	683	19	373	8
No				
Neutrophil count, %	56.5 ± 8.7	57.7 ± 9.2	56.8 ± 8.9	56.0 ± 10.1
Eosinophil count, %	2.7 ± 1.7	2.9 ± 2.1	2.7 ± 1.7	2.5 ± 0.7

Data are mean ± standard deviation or number of patients (%).

^aAntigens other than topical skin adhesives

ACD, allergic contact dermatitis.

Variable	2-octyl cyanoacrylate		n-butyl cyanoacrylate	
	Non-ACD (N = 719)	ACD (N = 20)	Non-ACD (N = 397)	ACD (N = 9)
Anatomiccal region	333	12	192	7
Lower leg including ankle joint	131	3	54	1
Forefoot	114	2	47	1
Midfoot	118	3	43	0
Hindfoot				
Data are mean ± standard deviation or number of patients (%).				
^a Antigens other than topical skin adhesives				
ACD, allergic contact dermatitis.				

Table 2

Results of logistic regression analysis to assess the risk factors of allergic contact dermatitis to topical skin adhesives.

Variable	ACD to 2-octyl cyanoacrylate (N = 20)		ACD to n-butyl cyanoacrylate (N = 9)	
	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value
Age	0.981 (0.955–1.008)	0.159	0.229 (0.545–1.394)	0.547
Female	1.029 (0.362–2.926)	0.957	0.893 (0.201–3.979)	0.882
Diabetes	0.853 (0.107–6.822)	0.880	N/A	N/A
Smoking	0.469 (0.099–2.223)	0.340	0.397 (0.041–3.868)	0.427
Asthma	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
History of atopic dermatitis	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
History of allergies ^a	0.980 (0.116–8.319)	0.985	3.075 (0.280–33.761)	0.358
Neutrophil count	1.018 (0.967–1.071)	0.498	0.987 (0.915–1.065)	0.735
Eosinophil count	1.078 (0.843–1.379)	0.550	0.848 (0.531–1.353)	0.488
Anatomiccal region	Reference value	0.806	Reference value	0.985
Lower leg including ankle joint	0.761 (0.205–2.824)	0.683	0.726 (0.082–6.410)	0.773
Forefoot	0.481 (0.105–2.199)	0.346	0.711(0.079–6.382)	0.761
Midfoot	0.789 (0.212–2.929)	0.723	N/A	N/A
Hindfoot				
^a Antigens other than topical skin adhesives				
ACD, allergic contact dermatitis; CI, confidence interval; N/A, not applicable				

Discussion

Although the use of topical skin adhesives has increased as an alternative to conventional skin closure methods, studies on the incidence and risk factors of ACD to topical skin adhesives have been limited. To address this issue, we reviewed 1027 patients who underwent skin closure with 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and n-butyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesives to investigate the incidence and risk factors of ACD to topical skin adhesives. The findings of this study showed that the incidence of ACD was 2.7% in 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and 2.2% in n-butyl cyanoacrylate, but none of the variables were found to increase the risk of ACD. In the trend of increasing the use of topical skin adhesives, these findings will help orthopaedic surgeons attempt to use topical skin adhesives to predict ACD and provide information to patients.

Prior to this study, four studies have reported the incidence of ACD in the use of 2-octyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesive. Chalmers et al.¹⁷ investigated 6008 patients who used 2-octyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesive for elective orthopaedic surgery and reported an incidence 0.5% of ACD. In addition, in joint arthroplasty surgery, Michalowicz et al.²³ reported an incidence of 1.8% in 281 patients and Durando et al.²⁴ reported 1.7% in 912 patients. Interestingly, Nakagawa et al.²⁵ reported a 7.0% incidence of ACD in 100 patients who underwent breast reconstruction surgery. Except for Nakagawa et al., our incidence of 2.7% is somewhat higher than the previously reported incidence, but studies to date alone cannot clarify whether this is due to the difference in application site or patient demographics.

Unlike 2-octyl cyanoacrylate, to the best of our knowledge, there has been no study on the incidence of ACD in n-butyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesives. We deduced that this is due to its lower popularity than 2-octyl cyanoacrylate as a topical skin adhesive. Although the clinical studies showed equivalent results between 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and n-butyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesives,^{26,27} the results of the animal studies showed that n-butyl cyanoacrylate is inferior in adhesion and wound-bursting strength than 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and would have led to less use of n-butyl cyanoacrylate than 2-octyl cyanoacrylate as a topical skin adhesive.^{28,29} In fact, n-butyl cyanoacrylate is increasingly preferred for vascular embolization, bleeding hemostasis, or corneal injury repair over skin closure.³⁰⁻³² However, because n-butyl cyanoacrylate remains a viable option as a topical skin adhesive, the results of this study would be helpful for surgeons planning to use n-butyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesive.

Studies investigating the inherent risk factors of ACD found that females have a higher susceptibility to ACD than males and due to the difference in hormonal influences and exposure mode to the allergen.²² However, in this study, the use of topical skin adhesive did not differ by sex, and the incidence of ACD was also not affected by sex. In addition, previous studies investigating the incidence of 2-octyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesives did not conclude that females are a risk factor for developing ACD.^{17,23,24} Therefore, the authors concluded that although females generally develop ACD more often than males, there is no sex difference in ACD that occurs after using 2-octyl cyanoacrylate and n-butyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesives.

This study has two limitations. First, patch tests were not conducted on all suspected patients to diagnose ACD, so the accuracy of the diagnosis could be doubted. However, although the patch test can precisely identify the antigens, it is not an absolute diagnostic criterion for ACD and the clinical features of the patients were sufficient for dermatologists to diagnose ACD.¹⁹ Therefore, we believe that the presence or absence of a patch test would not have significantly affected the results of the study. Second, the patients in this study were confined to the application of topical skin adhesives to foot and ankle surgeries so that generalization of the results to the whole body can be questioned. However, considering that the mechanism of type IV hypersensitivity does not differ depending on the body part and the used site was not a factor affecting the occurrence of the ACD,^{17,22} it is judged that the bias in the study population will not affect the generalization of the study results.

In conclusion, ACD, while uncommon, occurs in 2–3% of patients who used 2-octyl cyanoacrylate or n-butyl cyanoacrylate topical skin adhesives. ACD is difficult to predict due to the absence of risk factors, but clinicians and patients should be aware of these facts before using topical skin adhesives.

Abbreviations

ACD, Allergic contact dermatitis

Declarations

Data availability

All data supporting our findings are contained within the manuscript. All data in this study are freely available to any researcher for noncommercial purposes.

Funding

The authors did not receive support from any organization for the submitted work.

Author information

Affiliations

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Korea University Guro Hospital, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Young Hwan Park, Jeong Seok Choi, Jung Woo Choi, Hak Jun Kim

Contributions

Y.H.P.: study design, data analysis, and manuscript writing/editing. J.S.C. and J.W.C.: study design, and data analysis. H.J.K.: study design and supervision. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

Corresponding author

Correspondence to Hak Jun Kim.

Ethics declarations

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Glennie, R.A., Korczak, A., Naudie, D.D., Bryant, D.M. & Howard, J.L. MONOCRYL and DERMABOND vs Staples in Total Hip Arthroplasty Performed Through a Lateral Skin Incision: A Randomized Controlled Trial Using a Patient-Centered Assessment Tool. *J Arthroplasty***32**, 2431-2435 (2017).
2. Delmore, B. *et al.* Reducing Postsurgical Wound Complications: A Critical Review. *Adv Skin Wound Care***30**, 272-286 (2017).
3. El-Gazzar, Y. *et al.* The use of dermabond(R) as an adjunct to wound closure after total knee arthroplasty: examining immediate post-operative wound drainage. *J Arthroplasty***28**, 553-556 (2013).
4. Cochetti, G. *et al.* Surgical wound closure by staples or sutures?: Systematic review. *Medicine (Baltimore)***99**, e20573 (2020).
5. Krishnan, R., MacNeil, S.D. & Malvankar-Mehta, M.S. Comparing sutures versus staples for skin closure after orthopaedic surgery: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open***6**, e009257 (2016).
6. Shim, J.S., Lim, T.K., Koh, K.H. & Lee, D.K. Surgical treatment of congenital hallux varus. *Clin Orthop Surg***6**, 216-222 (2014).
7. Park, Y.H., Song, J.H., Choi, G.W. & Kim, H.J. Comparison of 2-Octyl Cyanoacrylate Topical Skin Adhesive and Simple Interrupted Nylon Sutures for Wound Closure in Ankle Fracture Surgery. *Foot Ankle Int***39**, 1283-1289 (2018).
8. Dowson, C.C., Gilliam, A.D., Speake, W.J., Lobo, D.N. & Beckingham, I.J. A prospective, randomized controlled trial comparing n-butyl cyanoacrylate tissue adhesive (LiquiBand) with sutures for skin closure after laparoscopic general surgical procedures. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech***16**, 146-150 (2006).
9. Lin, M., Coates, W.C. & Lewis, R.J. Tissue adhesive skills study: the physician learning curve. *Pediatr Emerg Care***20**, 219-223 (2004).
10. Quinn, J. *et al.* A randomized trial comparing octylcyanoacrylate tissue adhesive and sutures in the management of lacerations. *JAMA***277**, 1527-1530 (1997).
11. Spauwen, P.H., de Laat, W.A. & Hartman, E.H. Octyl-2-cyanoacrylate tissue glue (Dermabond) versus Monocryl 6 x 0 Sutures in lip closure. *Cleft Palate Craniofac J***43**, 625-627 (2006).
12. Scott, G.R., Carson, C.L. & Borah, G.L. Dermabond skin closures for bilateral reduction mammoplasties: a review of 255 consecutive cases. *Plast Reconstr Surg***120**, 1460-1465 (2007).
13. Singer, A.J., Kinariwala, M., Lirov, R. & Thode, H.C., Jr. Patterns of use of topical skin adhesives in the emergency department. *Acad Emerg Med***17**, 670-672 (2010).
14. Bouten, P.J. *et al.* The chemistry of tissue adhesive materials. *Progress in Polymer Science***39**, 1375-1405 (2014).

15. Leggat, P.A., Smith, D.R. & Kedjarune, U. Surgical applications of cyanoacrylate adhesives: a review of toxicity. *ANZ J Surg***77**, 209-213 (2007).
16. Singer, A.J. & Thode, H.C., Jr. A review of the literature on octylcyanoacrylate tissue adhesive. *Am J Surg***187**, 238-248 (2004).
17. Chalmers, B.P. *et al.* Characterizing the Diagnosis and Treatment of Allergic Contact Dermatitis to 2-Octyl Cyanoacrylate Used for Skin Closure in Elective Orthopedic Surgery. *J Arthroplasty***32**, 3742-3747 (2017).
18. Ghaferi, A.A., Schwartz, T.A. & Pawlik, T.M. STROBE Reporting Guidelines for Observational Studies. *JAMA Surg***156**, 577-578 (2021).
19. Usatine, R.P. & Riojas, M. Diagnosis and management of contact dermatitis. *Am Fam Physician***82**, 249-255 (2010).
20. Mailhol, C., Lauwers-Cances, V., Rance, F., Paul, C. & Giordano-Labadie, F. Prevalence and risk factors for allergic contact dermatitis to topical treatment in atopic dermatitis: a study in 641 children. *Allergy***64**, 801-806 (2009).
21. Belsito, D.V. The diagnostic evaluation, treatment, and prevention of allergic contact dermatitis in the new millennium. *J Allergy Clin Immunol***105**, 409-420 (2000).
22. Peiser, M. *et al.* Allergic contact dermatitis: epidemiology, molecular mechanisms, in vitro methods and regulatory aspects. Current knowledge assembled at an international workshop at BfR, Germany. *Cell Mol Life Sci***69**, 763-781 (2012).
23. Michalowicz, A., Comrie, R., Nicholas, C., Wagner, M. & Kehoe, J. Wound Complications after 2-Octyl Skin Closure Systems for Total Joint Arthroplasty. *J Bone Jt Infect***5**, 101-105 (2020).
24. Durando, D. *et al.* Allergic contact dermatitis to dermabond (2-octyl cyanoacrylate) after total knee arthroplasty. *Dermatitis***25**, 99-100 (2014).
25. Nakagawa, S. *et al.* Contact Dermatitis Caused by Dermabond Advanced Use. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open***6**, e1841 (2018).
26. Park, Y.H., Chang, A.S., Choi, G.W. & Kim, H.J. A comparison of three methods of skin closure following repair of Achilles tendon rupture. *Injury***49**, 1942-1946 (2018).
27. Osmond, M.H., Quinn, J.V., Sutcliffe, T., Jarmuske, M. & Klassen, T.P. A randomized, clinical trial comparing butylcyanoacrylate with octylcyanoacrylate in the management of selected pediatric facial lacerations. *Acad Emerg Med***6**, 171-177 (1999).

28. Singer, A.J., Perry, L.C. & Allen, R.L., Jr. In vivo study of wound bursting strength and compliance of topical skin adhesives. *Acad Emerg Med***15**, 1290-1294 (2008).
29. Singer, A.J. *et al.* Comparison of wound-bursting strengths and surface characteristics of FDA-approved tissue adhesives for skin closure. *J Adhes Sci Technol***18**, 19-27 (2004).
30. Ferguson, J.W., Tripathi, D. & Hayes, P.C. Review article: the management of acute variceal bleeding. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther***18**, 253-262 (2003).
31. Sharma, A. *et al.* Fibrin glue versus N-butyl-2-cyanoacrylate in corneal perforations. *Ophthalmology***110**, 291-298 (2003).
32. Kish, J.W., Katz, M.D., Marx, M.V., Harrell, D.S. & Hanks, S.E. N-butyl cyanoacrylate embolization for control of acute arterial hemorrhage. *J Vasc Interv Radio***15**, 689-695 (2004).

Figures



Figure 1

Clinical photograph of a patient showing well-demarcated pruritic eczematous eruption, papules, and vesicles that developed in the skin area to which topical skin adhesive was applied.