Journal of Neonatal Surgery
ISSN(Online): 2226-0439
Vol. 12, (2023)
https://www.jneonatalsurg.com

OPEN ACCESS

Blistering Disorders in the Elderly: Differential Diagnosis and Management Challenges

Zeiad Abdulaziz Alobead*[1], Asem AlMesfer[1], Ahmad Assiri[2]

[1]Department of Dermatology, King Fahad Medical City, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

[2]Department of Dermatology, Jazan University Hospital, Jazan, Saudi Arabia

***Corresponding author:**

Zeiad Abdulaziz Alobead,

Email ID: sts_611@hotmail.com

Cite this paper as: Zeiad Abdulaziz Alobead, Asem AlMesfer, Ahmad Assiri, (2023 Blistering Disorders in the Elderly: Differential Diagnosis and Management Challenges. *Journal of Neonatal Surgery*, 12, 136-146.

ABSTRACT

Background: The aging integument is particularly susceptible to a spectrum of blistering disorders, which present significant diagnostic and therapeutic challenges in the growing geriatric population. These conditions range from benign, trauma-induced blisters to severe, chronic autoimmune blistering diseases (AIBDs) like bullous pemphigoid (BP) and pemphigus vulgaris (PV), which carry substantial morbidity and mortality.

Objectives: This review aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of blistering disorders in the elderly, focusing on their pathophysiology, clinical presentation, diagnostic workup, and the unique complexities of management in this vulnerable demographic.

Methods: A detailed review of the scientific literature was conducted, synthesizing information on the epidemiology, pathogenesis, and evidence-based management of common geriatric blistering diseases in 3 data bases [PubMed – Google scholar- Google]. The analysis covers the structural and immunological basis of blister formation, the critical role of histopathology and direct immunofluorescence in diagnosis, and the tiered approach to treatment.

Results: The pathophysiological basis of blistering disorders involves a disruption of dermo-epidermal cohesion, driven by autoimmune responses against structural proteins like BP180, BP230, and desmogleins, against a backdrop of age-related skin fragility. Bullous pemphigoid is the most prevalent AIBD in the elderly, characterized by tense bullae and a pruritic prodrome, while pemphigus vulgaris, though rarer, is more acute and potentially fatal, presenting with flaccid bullae and mucosal erosions. Accurate diagnosis relies on a combination of clinical features, histopathology to determine blister level, and direct immunofluorescence to identify antibody deposition patterns. Management is a delicate balance, employing potent topical corticosteroids for limited disease and systemic immunosuppressants (e.g., corticosteroids, mycophenolate mofetil, azathioprine) for widespread involvement. For refractory cases, biologic agents like rituximab and intravenous immunoglobulin offer effective alternatives. Treatment in the elderly is complicated by polypharmacy and a high risk of adverse effects from immunosuppression, necessitating a tailored, multidisciplinary approach.

Conclusion: Blistering disorders in the elderly represent a complex interplay of immunosenescence and cutaneous aging. A systematic diagnostic approach is crucial for differentiating between AIBDs and other blistering conditions. Management must be highly individualized, prioritizing disease control while mitigating the profound risks associated with immunosuppressive therapies, with the ultimate goal of preserving quality of life and functional independence in this susceptible population.

Keywords: *Geriatric Dermatology, Autoimmune Blistering Diseases, Bullous Pemphigoid, Pemphigus Vulgaris*

1. INTRODUCTION

The integumentary system, the body's largest organ, undergoes a profound and inevitable series of transformations with advancing age, rendering it a vulnerable frontier for a multitude of pathological processes [1]. Among the most dramatic and clinically challenging presentations in geriatric dermatology are blistering disorders. The emergence of blisters in an elderly patient is a potent clinical sign, often triggering a complex diagnostic odyssey for the physician. This diagnostic challenge is rooted in the confluence of age-related physiological decline of the skin [2,3], the frequent presence of multiple comorbidities, and the use of polypharmacy, which can both mimic and precipitate blistering diseases [8]. The initial

presentation of vesicles and bullae can represent a spectrum of conditions ranging from benign, transient reactions to severe, chronic, and potentially life-threatening autoimmune or inflammatory diseases. Therefore, a meticulous and systematic approach is paramount, as the implications for management, quality of life, and mortality are substantial [4].

The aged skin, or xerosis cutis senilis, is characterized by a constellation of structural and functional alterations that predispose it to fragility and blister formation [2]. Epidermal thinning, specifically a reduction in the number and size of keratinocytes, leads to a flattening of the dermo-epidermal junction, thereby diminishing the adhesive surface area between these two critical layers [1]. Concurrently, the dermis experiences a marked reduction in collagen content, particularly type I and III collagen, and a decrease in the synthesis and organization of elastin fibers [3]. This results in a loss of tensile strength, elasticity, and overall mechanical integrity. Furthermore, the number and function of dermal fibroblasts, the architects of the extracellular matrix, decline with age [2]. The papillary dermis, rich in capillaries, also undergoes atrophy, contributing to impaired nutrient delivery and waste removal [1]. Perhaps most critically for blister pathogenesis, the structure and composition of the basement membrane zone (BMZ) are altered. Key adhesive structures, such as hemidesmosomes and anchoring fibrils, which are composed of proteins like type XVII collagen (BP180) and type VII collagen, respectively, may become functionally compromised [3]. This aged architectural landscape creates a microenvironment where minor friction, pressure, or inflammatory insults that would be inconsequential in younger skin can result in significant cleavage and blister formation, a phenomenon clinically recognized as "dermatoporosis" or the "skin fragility syndrome" [2].

When confronted with a blistering eruption in an elderly individual, the differential diagnosis must be prioritized based on both prevalence and acuity. Foremost among the primary AIBDs is bullous pemphigoid (BP), which is the most common autoimmune blistering disease in the Western world and has a striking predilection for individuals over 70 years of age [4]. The pathogenesis of BP is well-characterized, involving the production of autoantibodies, predominantly IgG, directed against two hemidesmosomal antigens: BP180 (type XVII collagen) and BP230. These autoantibodies bind to the BMZ, activating complement and recruiting inflammatory cells, particularly neutrophils and eosinophils, leading to the release of proteolytic enzymes that disrupt dermo-epidermal adhesion and cause subepidermal blister formation [4]. Clinically, BP often presents with a prodromal phase of intense pruritus and eczematous or urticarial plaques, which can last for weeks or months before the classic, tense, fluid-filled bullae appear on erythematous or normal-appearing skin. The distribution is typically widespread and symmetrical, favoring the flexural aspects of the limbs and the abdomen [4]. A significant clinical challenge is that the classic bullae may be absent in up to 20% of cases, a variant known as non-bullous or pre-bullous pemphigoid, which can easily be misdiagnosed as eczema, urticaria, or drug eruptions [1].

Beyond bullous pemphigoid, the differential diagnosis must encompass a range of other AIBDs, each with distinct clinical and immunopathological signatures. Pemphigus vulgaris, while less common than BP in the elderly, is a potentially fatal disease characterized by flaccid, fragile blisters and painful erosions affecting the skin and mucous membranes [5]. Its pathogenesis involves autoantibodies against desmoglein 3, and less frequently desmoglein 1, which are desmosomal cadherins responsible for interkeratinocyte adhesion. The loss of this adhesion causes acantholysis and the formation of intraepidermal blisters [5]. Mucous membrane pemphigoid (MMP), previously known as cicatricial pemphigoid, is another critical entity defined by autoantibodies targeting various components of the BMZ, such as BP180, laminin-332, and type VII collagen [6]. The hallmark of MMP is blistering that predominantly affects mucous membranes—including the oral, ocular, and genital mucosa—and leads to scarring and significant morbidity, such as symblepharon and blindness in ocular involvement [6]. Epidermolysis bullosa acquisita (EBA) is a rare, chronic subepidermal blistering disease caused by autoantibodies against type VII collagen, the primary component of anchoring fibrils [7]. Its clinical presentation can be heterogeneous, ranging from a classical, non-inflammatory, mechanobullous form with blisters on trauma-prone sites mimicking hereditary epidermolysis bullosa, to an inflammatory BP-like form, making clinical distinction difficult [7].

It is imperative to recognize that not all blisters in the elderly are a manifestation of a primary autoimmune disorder. A broad and vigilant differential is essential [8]. One of the most common and often overlooked causes is simple friction, which, against the backdrop of fragile aged skin, can produce substantial bullae, a condition sometimes termed "bullosis diabeticorum" when it occurs in diabetic patients, though it is not exclusive to them. Staphylococcal Scalded Skin Syndrome (SSSS), caused by exotoxin-producing strains of *Staphylococcus aureus*, is typically a disease of infancy but can occur in adults with renal insufficiency or immunosuppression, both more common in the elderly [8]. The exotoxins cleave desmoglein 1 in the superficial epidermis, leading to widespread, tender erythema and superficial blistering. Allergic contact dermatitis, particularly from topical medications applied to compromised skin, can present with a vigorous vesicular or bullous reaction. Drug-induced blistering disorders represent a critical diagnostic category; numerous medications commonly prescribed to the elderly, such as furosemide, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), and antibiotics, can trigger a bullous pemphigoid-like eruption or a linear IgA disease [8]. Furthermore, metabolic conditions like porphyria cutanea tarda (PCT) must be considered; it results from a deficiency in the enzyme uroporphyrinogen decarboxylase, leading to photosensitivity, skin fragility, and bullae on sun-exposed areas, such as the dorsa of the hands [8]. The management of blistering diseases in the elderly is fraught with unique challenges, as the cornerstone of treatment for most AIBDs is systemic immunosuppression with corticosteroids and steroid-sparing agents [9]. The elderly population is particularly susceptible to

the adverse effects of these therapies, including glucose intolerance, hypertension, osteoporosis, increased risk of infections, and gastrointestinal complications, which can significantly alter the risk-benefit calculus and necessitate a more cautious, often multi-disciplinary, therapeutic approach [9].

Pathophysiology of Blistering Disorders: Mechanisms Underlying Blister Formation

The formation of a blister, or vesicobullous lesion, represents the final common pathway of a disruption in the meticulous architecture that binds the epidermis to the dermis or maintains the integrity of the epidermis itself. This process is not a single entity but rather a culmination of diverse pathological mechanisms that can be broadly categorized into failures of mechanical cohesion, dysregulated autoimmune responses, and underlying genetic susceptibilities. Fundamentally, a blister is a circumscribed collection of fluid, either serum, blood, or plasma, that accumulates within or beneath the epidermis due to a loss of intercellular adhesion (acantholysis) or a breakdown of the dermo-epidermal junction (DEJ) [9]. The specific location and mechanism of this cleavage define the clinical and histological characteristics of the disease, and understanding these pathways is critical for accurate diagnosis and targeted therapy.

The structural integrity of the skin is maintained by a complex network of cellular adhesions, the most critical being the desmosomes for epidermal keratinocyte-to-keratinocyte attachment and the hemidesmosomal-anchoring filament complex for epidermal-dermal adherence. Desmosomes are patch-like intercellular junctions that tether intermediate filaments (keratins) of the cytoskeleton between adjacent keratinocytes, providing mechanical resilience [10]. They are composed of transmembrane glycoproteins, primarily desmogleins (Dsg) and desmocollins, which interact homophilically with their counterparts on the neighboring cell. Intracellularly, these cadherins bind to plaque proteins like plakoglobin and desmoplakin, which, in turn, link to the keratin intermediate filament network. A failure in any component of this system, whether through autoimmune antibody attack or genetic mutation, results in acantholysis—the loss of intercellular adhesion—and the formation of an intraepidermal blister, as seen in the pemphigus family of diseases [11].

The attachment of the entire epidermis to the underlying dermis is secured by the basement membrane zone (BMZ), a sophisticated ultrastructural entity. Keratinocytes in the basal layer are anchored to the underlying basal lamina by hemidesmosomes. These structures are composed of an intracellular plaque containing plectin and BP230, which connect to the keratin cytoskeleton. The transmembrane component, integrin α6β4, extends into the extracellular space and binds to laminin-332 (formerly laminin-5), a key component of the lamina lucida. Laminin-332 then binds to type IV collagen in the lamina densa. Finally, anchoring fibrils, composed primarily of type VII collagen, extend from the lamina densa into the papillary dermis, looping around dermal collagen fibers to secure the entire complex [12]. This multi-protein apparatus, often likened to a "spot weld," is essential for resisting shearing forces. Autoantibodies directed against components of this complex, such as BP180, laminin-332, or type VII collagen, disrupt these critical connections, leading to a subepidermal blister, which is the hallmark of diseases like bullous pemphigoid, mucous membrane pemphigoid, and epidermolysis bullosa acquisita [13].

Autoimmune responses constitute the primary pathophysiological driver for the majority of significant blistering disorders in the elderly. The paradigm is bullous pemphigoid (BP), a prototypical autoantibody-mediated disease. The initial event is the loss of immune tolerance, leading to the production of IgG autoantibodies, predominantly of the IgG4 and IgG1 subclasses, directed against two hemidesmosomal proteins: BP180 (a type XVII collagen transmembrane protein) and BP230 (an intracellular plakin protein) [13]. While BP230 is intracellular, its immunodominant epitopes may become exposed during normal keratinocyte apoptosis or minor trauma. However, BP180 is the major pathogenic antigen. These autoantibodies bind to their target antigens at the DEJ, leading to the activation of the classical complement pathway. The generation of complement cleavage products, notably C3a and C5a (anaphylatoxins), acts as potent chemoattractants for inflammatory cells, primarily neutrophils and eosinophils [14].

The recruited leukocytes then migrate to the DEJ, a process facilitated by upregulated endothelial adhesion molecules on local dermal capillaries. Upon arrival, neutrophils and eosinophils become activated by the immune complexes and release a barrage of proteolytic enzymes, including matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs like collagenase and gelatinase), neutrophil elastase, and eosinophil-derived major basic protein and eosinophil peroxidase [14]. These enzymes act synergistically to degrade the extracellular matrix components of the BMZ, effectively digesting the structural proteins that maintain dermo-epidermal adhesion. The result is a clean separation between the epidermis and dermis at the level of the lamina lucida, forming a tense, subepidermal blister. The critical role of inflammation is underscored by the dense inflammatory infiltrate seen histologically in BP lesions and the clinical efficacy of anti-inflammatory and immunosuppressive therapies [9, 13].

In pemphigus vulgaris (PV), the autoimmune attack follows a different, predominantly cellular, pathway. The autoantibodies are directed against desmoglein 3 (Dsg3), and in mucocutaneous variants, also Dsg1. The prevailing theory of pathogenesis, known as the "Desmoglein Compensation Theory," explains the site of blistering based on the expression patterns of Dsg isoforms [11]. Dsg1 is expressed more superficially in the epidermis, while Dsg3 is expressed more deeply in the suprabasal layers. In PV, anti-Dsg3 antibodies alone cause blisters in the deep, suprabasal epidermis of mucous membranes where Dsg3 is predominant and Dsg1 is scarce. When both anti-Dsg3 and anti-Dsg1 are present, blisters also occur on the skin. The binding of IgG autoantibodies to Dsg triggers a complex intracellular signaling cascade. Initially, it was believed that steric

hindrance alone caused acantholysis, but it is now clear that cellular signaling is paramount. Antibody binding can lead to internalization and depletion of Dsg from the cell surface, a process known as endocytosis. Furthermore, it activates intracellular pathways involving protein kinases such as p38 mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) and Rho GTPase, leading to the phosphorylation of plakoglobin and desmoplakin, and the subsequent collapse of the keratin cytoskeleton [15]. This signaling cascade also stimulates the production of epithelial cell-derived plasminogen activator, leading to increased plasmin, a protease that contributes to the degradation of intercellular adhesions. The net result is the dissolution of desmosomes, roundening up of keratinocytes (acantholytic cells), and the formation of a flaccid, intraepidermal blister [11, 15].

While autoimmune mechanisms are acquired, genetic factors can predispose individuals to blistering disorders, either by causing monogenic diseases or by influencing susceptibility to autoimmune variants. The classic examples are the various forms of hereditary epidermolysis bullosa (EB), which result from mutations in genes encoding the very structural proteins targeted in autoimmune blistering diseases [12]. For instance, mutations in the genes for keratin 5 or 14, which form the intermediate filament network in basal keratinocytes, cause Epidermolysis Bullosa Simplex, where mild trauma causes basal cell cytolysis and intraepidermal blistering. Mutations in the genes encoding laminin-332 or type XVII collagen (BP180) cause Junctional Epidermolysis Bullosa, characterized by blistering within the lamina lucida. Similarly, mutations in the type VII collagen gene cause Dystrophic Epidermolysis Bullosa, with blistering below the lamina densa due to absent or defective anchoring fibrils [12, 16]. These genetic lesions create a state of inherent mechanical fragility.

Beyond monogenic disorders, genetic factors also influence an individual's propensity to develop autoimmune blistering diseases. Certain human leukocyte antigen (HLA) class II alleles are strongly associated with these conditions, as they govern the presentation of autoantigenic peptides to T-helper cells, thereby initiating the autoimmune response. For example, BP is associated with HLA-DQβ1*03:01, pemphigus vulgaris is strikingly linked to HLA-DRβ1*04:02 and HLA-DRβ1*14, and dermatitis herpetiformis, a blistering manifestation of celiac disease, is associated with HLA-DQ2 and HLA-DQ8 haplotypes [9]. The presence of these permissive HLA alleles, in conjunction with other unknown genetic modifiers and environmental triggers (such as drug exposure, UV radiation, or viral infections), is thought to lower the threshold for breaking immune tolerance, leading to the production of pathogenic autoantibodies and the clinical onset of disease [13].

Common Blistering Disorders in the Elderly

The geriatric population presents a unique dermatological landscape where the incidence of specific blistering diseases, particularly autoimmune blistering diseases (AIBDs), rises significantly. The interplay between immunosenescence, cumulative environmental exposures, and the inherent fragility of aged skin creates a fertile ground for these often-chronic and debilitating conditions. Among the spectrum of AIBDs, bullous pemphigoid (BP) stands out as the most prevalent, while pemphigus vulgaris (PV) represents a less common but more acutely life-threatening entity. Furthermore, a distinction must be made between these acquired autoimmune conditions and the manifestation of genetic disorders like epidermolysis bullosa (EB) in adulthood, which, though rare, can present diagnostic challenges. A detailed analysis of their epidemiology, clinical features, and diagnostic hallmarks is essential for any clinician managing elderly patients with dermatological complaints.

1. Bullous Pemphigoid (BP)

Bullous pemphigoid is the most common autoimmune blistering disease in the Western world, with a pronounced predilection for the elderly. Its incidence increases dramatically after the age of 70, with reported rates ranging from 150 to 430 new cases per million population per year in this age group, and it may be even higher in institutionalized individuals [17]. There is no consistent racial predilection, and some studies suggest a slight male predominance. The pathogenesis, as detailed previously, involves autoantibodies against the hemidesmosomal proteins BP180 (type XVII collagen) and BP230, leading to a subepidermal blister [13, 18].

Clinically, BP often begins with a non-bullous prodromal phase that can persist for weeks or even months. This phase is characterized by intense, often intractable pruritus, along with eczematous, urticarial, or papular lesions. This presentation frequently leads to misdiagnosis as xerosis, scabies, or allergic contact dermatitis, delaying appropriate treatment [17]. The classic bullous phase eventually emerges, characterized by large, tense, fluid-filled bullae that appear on erythematous or normal-appearing skin. These blisters are remarkably robust due to their subepidermal location, which allows the relatively thick and durable epidermis to form a roof over the blister cavity. The distribution is typically widespread and symmetrical, with a preference for flexural areas, including the inner thighs, axillae, groin, and lower abdomen. Mucous membrane involvement occurs in 10-30% of cases but is usually mild and transient, unlike in other AIBDs [18]. A positive Nikolsky sign (induction of blistering by lateral pressure on perilesional skin) is typically negative in BP, which helps distinguish it from PV. The course of BP is variable, ranging from self-limited in a minority of cases to a chronic, relapsing-remitting disease that requires long-term immunosuppressive therapy. Morbidity is significant due to the pruritus, pain, and impaired skin barrier, which increases the risk of secondary infection and sepsis, a leading cause of mortality in these patients [19].

2. Pemphigus Vulgaris (PV)

Pemphigus vulgaris is a much rarer but historically fatal AIBD if left untreated. Its incidence is approximately 0.1 to 0.5 per

100,000 people per year, with a peak onset between the ages of 40 and 60, meaning a substantial number of patients present in their early elderly years [20]. There is a well-documented higher incidence in patients of Ashkenazi Jewish and Mediterranean descent, strongly linked to specific HLA class II alleles (HLA-DRβ1*04:02 and *14:01) [11, 20]. The disease is driven by pathogenic IgG autoantibodies directed against desmoglein 3 (Dsg3), and often also Dsg1, leading to the loss of interkeratinocyte adhesion (acantholysis) and the formation of flaccid, intraepidermal blisters.

The clinical presentation of PV is distinct from that of BP. The primary lesion is a flaccid, fragile vesicle or bulla that arises on otherwise normal-appearing skin. These blisters rupture extremely easily with minimal trauma, leaving behind painful, denuded erosions that can crust over and extend peripherally. A positive Nikolsky sign is a cardinal feature, where applying lateral pressure to normal-appearing skin adjacent to a lesion causes the epidermis to shear off [11]. Mucous membrane involvement is not only common but is frequently the initial presenting sign in over 50% of patients. Painful oral erosions are almost universal during the disease course, and other mucosal surfaces, such as the pharynx, larynx, conjunctiva, and genitals, can also be affected [20]. This can lead to severe complications, including dysphagia, malnutrition, and hoarseness. Before the advent of systemic corticosteroids, the mortality rate for PV approached 90% within one year, primarily due to fluid and electrolyte imbalance and secondary sepsis from the extensive erosions. While modern immunosuppressive therapy has dramatically improved survival, the disease and its treatment continue to carry significant morbidity and mortality, especially in the vulnerable elderly population [9].

3. Epidermolysis Bullosa Acquisita (EBA)

Epidermolysis bullosa acquisita is a rare chronic subepidermal blistering disease with an estimated incidence of 0.2 to 0.5 new cases per million per year. It can occur at any age, but there is a bimodal age distribution with peaks in childhood and between the 4th and 5th decades, meaning it is relevant in the younger elderly population [21]. EBA is defined by the presence of autoantibodies against type VII collagen, the primary component of the anchoring fibrils located in the sub-lamina densa region of the DEJ [7, 21]. This fundamental difference in the target antigen and the ultrastructural level of cleavage distinguishes it from BP.

The clinical presentation of EBA is notably heterogeneous, which contributes to its diagnostic challenge. The classic or "mechanobullous" form mimics hereditary dystrophic EB, presenting with skin fragility, milia (small epidermal cysts), and non-inflammatory blisters, erosions, and scarring on trauma-prone sites such as the dorsal hands, knuckles, elbows, knees, and feet. Dystrophic or absent nails is a common finding. The "BP-like" inflammatory variant presents with widespread, tense bullae on erythematous skin, making it clinically indistinguishable from BP [21]. A third, "MMP-like" variant presents primarily with mucosal involvement and scarring. The course of EBA is typically chronic and refractory to therapy. Unlike BP, which often responds well to corticosteroids, EBA is notoriously difficult to treat, frequently requiring more potent immunosuppressants like colchicine, dapsone, or rituximab [22]. The chronic scarring can lead to contractures and significant functional impairment, particularly when the hands and mucosal surfaces are involved.

Comparative Analysis and Epidemiology

The epidemiology of these conditions underscores their significance in geriatric dermatology. Bullous pemphigoid is a disease of the aged, with its incidence rising in parallel with increasing life expectancy. In contrast, pemphigus vulgaris, while still occurring in the elderly, has its peak incidence in middle age. EBA remains rare across all age groups. The table below provides a consolidated comparison of their key characteristics.

Table 1: Comparison of Major Autoimmune Blistering Diseases in the Elderly

Feature	Bullous Pemphigoid (BP)	Pemphigus Vulgaris (PV)	Epidermolysis Bullosa Acquisita (EBA)
Peak Age of Onset	>70 years	40-60 years	Bimodal (Childhood & 40-50s)
Incidence	Common (150-430/million/year in elderly)	Rare (0.1-0.5/100,000/year)	Very Rare (0.2-0.5/million/year)
Primary Autoantigen	BP180 (type XVII collagen)	Desmoglein 3 (and Dsg1)	Type VII Collagen
Level of Blister	Subepidermal (lamina lucida)	Intraepidermal (suprabasal)	Subepidermal (sublamina densa)
Classical Lesion	Tense, robust bullae	Flaccid, fragile bullae	Tense bullae (inflammatory) or non-inflammatory blisters (classic)

Nikolsky Sign	Negative	Positive	Negative
Mucous Membranes	10-30%, mild	>90%, often severe and initial	Common in MMP-like variant
Scarring/Milia	Uncommon	Uncommon	Common (in classic form)
Key Diagnostic Clue	Linear IgG/C3 at DEJ on DIF	Intercellular IgG on DIF	Linear IgG at DEJ on DIF; positive salt-split skin on IIF

Abbreviations: DIF, Direct Immunofluorescence; IIF, Indirect Immunofluorescence; DEJ, Dermo-Epidermal Junction.

Beyond these three primary entities, other blistering conditions must be considered in the differential diagnosis for an elderly patient. **Dermatitis Herpetiformis (DH)**, an intensely pruritic blistering disease associated with gluten-sensitive enteropathy (celiac disease), presents with grouped, excoriated papules and vesicles on the extensor surfaces (elbows, knees, buttocks). Its pathophysiology involves IgA deposition in the dermal papillae [23]. **Linear IgA Disease (LAD)** can occur in adults and is characterized by annular or linear arrangements of vesicles and bullae, sometimes described as a "string of pearls." While more common in children (chronic bullous disease of childhood), the adult form can be drug-induced or idiopathic [24]. Finally, **porphyria cutanea tarda (PCT)**, the most common porphyria, presents with skin fragility, bullae, milia, and hypertrichosis on sun-exposed areas, particularly the dorsa of the hands. It is caused by a deficiency of uroporphyrinogen decarboxylase and is associated with factors like hepatitis C, alcohol use, and estrogen therapy, which may be relevant in an elderly population [8]. A thorough clinical history, physical examination, and targeted diagnostic tests are therefore indispensable for navigating this complex diagnostic landscape.

Clinical Presentation and Diagnostic Criteria

The accurate diagnosis of a blistering disorder in an elderly patient hinges upon a meticulous and systematic approach that integrates a comprehensive history, a detailed physical examination, and the judicious use of targeted laboratory investigations. The initial clinical impression, while invaluable, is often insufficient for a definitive diagnosis due to the significant overlap in the morphology of blistering diseases. Therefore, the clinician must function as a detective, piecing together clues from the patient's story, the physical distribution and characteristics of the lesions, and, ultimately, the histopathological and immunopathological findings to arrive at a precise diagnosis that will guide management. The diagnostic pathway is a multi-step process designed to first confirm the presence of an autoimmune blistering disease and then to specify its exact type.

The diagnostic journey begins with a thorough history-taking, which can provide critical directional clues. Key elements to elucidate include the onset and evolution of the eruption. A prolonged prodrome of intense pruritus with eczematous or urticarial lesions is highly suggestive of bullous pemphigoid (BP), whereas the acute onset of painful oral erosions preceding skin lesions points strongly toward pemphigus vulgaris (PV) [18, 25]. A thorough review of systems is essential, inquiring about symptoms of mucosal involvement (oral pain, dysphagia, hoarseness, ocular irritation), which are paramount in PV and mucous membrane pemphigoid (MMP). A complete medication history is mandatory, as numerous drugs (e.g., penicillamine, ACE inhibitors, NSAIDs, furosemide) can trigger pemphigoid- or pemphigus-like eruptions or linear IgA disease [24, 26]. The history should also assess for associated conditions; for instance, dermatitis herpetiformis (DH) is linked with gluten-sensitive enteropathy, and epidermolysis bullosa acquisita (EBA) can be associated with inflammatory bowel disease or systemic lupus erythematosus [22, 23].

The physical examination provides the most immediate and tangible data for constructing a differential diagnosis. The primary step is a meticulous characterization of the primary lesion. One must distinguish between *flaccid* blisters that rupture easily, leaving erosions (highly characteristic of PV and other pemphigus variants), and *tense*, robust bullae that remain intact for longer periods (typical of subepidermal blistering diseases like BP, EBA, and porphyria cutanea tarda). The **Nikolsky sign** is a critical bedside test; it is performed by applying lateral sliding pressure to the skin. A positive sign, where the epidermis shears off, is highly characteristic of PV and is typically negative in BP and EBA [11, 25]. The **Asboe-Hansen sign** (bulbous pressure sign), where pressure on top of a blister causes the fluid to extend laterally into the adjacent epidermis, is another indicator of acantholysis seen in pemphigus.

The distribution of lesions is equally informative. BP often shows a predilection for flexural areas (axillae, groin, inner thighs), while DH has a classic symmetrical distribution on extensor surfaces (elbows, knees, buttocks, and scapulae) [23]. EBA in its classic form affects trauma-prone sites like the dorsal hands, knuckles, and feet [21]. A careful examination of all mucous membranes (oral, conjunctival, genital, nasal) is non-negotiable. Widespread, painful erosions in the mouth are a hallmark of PV, while predominant ocular involvement with scarring (symblepharon) is the signature of MMP [6, 20]. The presence of scarring, milia (small, white epidermal cysts representing failed re-epithelialization of a blister), and nail dystrophy are chronic changes more commonly associated with EBA and MMP than with BP [21].

While history and physical examination narrow the differential diagnosis, laboratory confirmation is almost always required

for a definitive diagnosis. The cornerstone of laboratory evaluation is the skin biopsy, and in most cases, *two* biopsies are recommended: one for routine histopathology (formalin-fixed) and one for direct immunofluorescence (DIF) (Michel's medium or saline-soaked).

Histopathology (H&E Staining): This examines the microscopic level of blister formation and the nature of the inflammatory infiltrate.

Pemphigus Vulgaris: Shows an *intraepidermal* blister just above the basal layer with acantholytic cells (rounded-up, detached keratinocytes) floating within the blister cavity. The basal layer remains attached to the dermis, likened to a "row of tombstones" [25].

Bullous Pemphigoid: Reveals a *subepidermal* blister with an inflammatory infiltrate that is typically rich in eosinophils. Eosinophils may align along the dermo-epidermal junction and can be found within the blister cavity [18].

Epidermolysis Bullosa Acquisita: Also shows a *subepidermal* blister. In the classic, non-inflammatory form, the infiltrate may be sparse, while the inflammatory variant can be histologically indistinguishable from BP. The presence of milia and scarring in chronic lesions can be a clue [21].

Dermatitis Herpetiformis: Demonstrates neutrophilic microabscesses at the tips of dermal papillae, which may coalesce to form a subepidermal blister [23].

Direct Immunofluorescence (DIF): This is the gold-standard test for confirming an autoimmune blistering disease. It detects the presence and pattern of antibody deposits *in the patient's own skin*.

Pemphigus Vulgaris: Shows a net-like or chicken-wire pattern of IgG and C3 deposition on the cell surfaces of keratinocytes throughout the epidermis [25].

Bullous Pemphigoid: Reveals linear deposits of IgG and/or C3 along the dermo-epidermal junction [18].

Epidermolysis Bullosa Acquisita: Also shows linear IgG deposits at the DEJ, making it indistinguishable from BP on standard DIF [21].

Dermatitis Herpetiformis: Shows granular or fibrillar deposits of IgA in the dermal papillae, which is pathognomonic for the disease [23].

Indirect Immunofluorescence (IIF) and Serology: When DIF is positive, further serological tests can help refine the diagnosis. IIF detects circulating autoantibodies in the patient's serum.

Salt-Split Skin IIF: This is a critical test for differentiating subepidermal blistering diseases. Normal human skin is incubated in 1M NaCl, which cleaves the lamina lucida. The serum is then applied.

In **BP**, autoantibodies bind to the *epidermal* (roof) side of the split.

In **EBA**, autoantibodies bind to the *dermal* (floor) side of the split. This test is highly specific for distinguishing these two entities [27].

Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA): These are highly sensitive and quantitative assays for specific autoantibodies.

BP180 NC16A and BP230 ELISA: Used to confirm BP and monitor disease activity [28].

Dsg1 and Dsg3 ELISA: Used to confirm PV and its variants; anti-Dsg3 is typical for mucosal-dominant PV, while both anti-Dsg1 and anti-Dsg3 are found in mucocutaneous PV [29].

The following table summarizes the key diagnostic features of the major blistering disorders.

Table 2: Diagnostic Criteria for Major Blistering Disorders in the Elderly

Diagnostic Feature	Bullous Pemphigoid (BP)	Pemphigus Vulgaris (PV)	Epidermolysis Bullosa Acquisita (EBA)	Dermatitis Herpetiformis (DH)
Primary Lesion	Tense bullae	Flaccid bullae, erosions	Tense bullae (inflammatory) or erosions (classic)	Grouped papules/vesicles
Nikolsky Sign	Negative	Positive	Negative	Negative
Mucosal Involvement	Mild (10-30%)	Severe (>90%), often initial	Common in MMP-like variant	Rare

Histopathology (H&E)	Subepidermal blister with eosinophils	Intraepidermal blister, acantholysis	Subepidermal blister; variable inflammation	Neutrophilic microabscesses in dermal papillae
Direct IF (DIF)	**Linear IgG/C3** at DEJ	**Intercellular IgG/C3**	**Linear IgG** at DEJ	**Granular IgA** in dermal papillae
Indirect IF (Salt-Split)	Antibodies bind to **epidermal roof**	(Not typically used)	Antibodies bind to **dermal floor**	(Not typically used)
Specific ELISA	BP180 NC16A, BP230	**Desmoglein 1 & 3**	Type VII Collagen	(Not available; anti-tTG for associated celiac)

Management Strategies and Treatment Options

The management of autoimmune blistering diseases (AIBDs) in the elderly population represents a profound therapeutic challenge, necessitating a delicate balance between achieving rapid disease control and minimizing the significant treatment-associated morbidity and mortality. The cornerstone of therapy for moderate to severe disease is immunosuppression, but the physiological decline in organ function, altered pharmacokinetics, and high prevalence of comorbidities in older adults demand a tailored, often conservative, and always vigilant approach. The therapeutic ladder typically ascends from potent topical therapies for limited disease to systemic immunosuppressants for widespread involvement, with the overarching goals of healing existing lesions, preventing new blister formation, improving quality of life, and avoiding, where possible, the devastating consequences of long-term, high-dose systemic corticosteroid use [30].

For patients with localized or mild bullous pemphigoid (BP), first-line intervention may consist of **super-potent topical corticosteroids**, such as clobetasol propionate 0.05%. The landmark randomized controlled trial by Joly et al. demonstrated that for patients with moderate BP, a standardized regimen of topical clobetasol (40 grams per day) was superior to oral prednisone (0.5 mg/kg/day) in achieving one-year survival rates, with a significantly lower incidence of severe side effects [31]. This paradigm-shifting study established that topical corticosteroids are not merely adjuncts but can be primary therapy for a substantial portion of the BP population. The mechanism involves localized anti-inflammatory and immunosuppressive effects, reducing the recruitment and activation of eosinophils and neutrophils at the dermo-epidermal junction without incurring systemic exposure. For oral pemphigus vulgaris (PV) erosions, high-potency **topical corticosteroids** (e.g., fluocinonide gel) or **topical calcineurin inhibitors** (e.g., tacrolimus ointment) can provide symptomatic relief and may aid in healing, though they are adjunctive to systemic therapy [32].

For widespread, severe, or rapidly progressive disease, **systemic corticosteroids** remain the initial gold standard for inducing remission. In BP, oral prednisone is typically initiated at doses of 0.5 to 0.75 mg/kg/day, while in the more severe PV, doses often start at 1.0 to 1.5 mg/kg/day [30, 33]. The rationale is to provide rapid, broad-spectrum immunosuppression to halt the pathogenic antibody-mediated inflammation. However, the elderly are exquisitely susceptible to corticosteroid toxicities, including glucose intolerance or new-onset diabetes, hypertension, fluid retention, glaucoma, cataracts, and, most critically, accelerated osteoporosis and an increased risk of fractures. Furthermore, the catabolic state induced by corticosteroids can lead to proximal myopathy, further impairing mobility and independence. Therefore, the goal is to achieve control as quickly as possible and then initiate a steady taper, often reducing the dose by 10-20% every 1-2 weeks once new blister formation has ceased [30].

To facilitate corticosteroid tapering and to serve as long-term, steroid-sparing agents, a variety of **adjuvant immunosuppressive drugs** are employed. These agents have a slower onset of action but offer a more favorable long-term safety profile for maintenance therapy.

Mycophenolate Mofetil (MME): This inhibitor of purine synthesis selectively targets T and B lymphocytes. It has proven efficacy in both BP and PV and is generally well-tolerated, with gastrointestinal upset and potential bone marrow suppression being its main concerns. Doses typically range from 1 to 2 grams daily [34].

Azathioprine: A purine analogue that suppresses cellular and humoral immunity. Its use requires testing for thiopurine methyltransferase (TPMT) enzyme activity prior to initiation to identify patients at high risk for severe myelosuppression. It is a classic steroid-sparing agent, though its slower onset and hepatotoxicity potential can be limitations [33].

Methotrexate: A folate antagonist that has shown efficacy, particularly in BP, at low weekly doses (e.g., 5-15 mg). It is a cost-effective option but requires monitoring for hepatotoxicity and myelosuppression, and its use may be contraindicated in patients with renal impairment [35].

Dapsone: A sulfone antibiotic with anti-inflammatory effects, particularly on neutrophil function. It is highly effective in

dermatitis herpetiformis (DH) and can be useful in linear IgA disease and as an adjunct in mild to moderate BP, especially when the inflammatory infiltrate is rich in neutrophils. Its use is limited by the risk of dose-dependent hemolytic anemia and methemoglobinemia, necessitating close monitoring, particularly in patients with G6PD deficiency [23].

In cases of severe, refractory, or corticosteroid-resistant disease, more targeted **biologic and immunomodulatory therapies** are employed.

Rituximab: A monoclonal antibody directed against the CD20 antigen on B lymphocytes, leading to their depletion. It has revolutionized the treatment of moderate-to-severe PV, with clinical trials demonstrating superior outcomes compared to standard immunosuppression alone [36]. Rituximab is now often considered first-line therapy for severe PV in appropriate candidates. Its use in refractory BP is also growing. While highly effective, it carries risks of infusion reactions and a significantly increased susceptibility to serious infections, requiring rigorous screening and prophylactic measures [36].

Intravenous Immunoglobulin (IVIG): This therapy involves the infusion of pooled human immunoglobulins from thousands of donors. Its mechanism in AIBDs is multifactorial, including Fc receptor blockade, neutralization of pathogenic autoantibodies, and inhibition of complement activation. IVIG is a highly effective and relatively safe option for severe, refractory cases of both PV and BP, as it does not cause generalized immunosuppression. Its limitations include high cost, the need for intravenous access, and a transient effect requiring repeated cycles every 3-4 weeks [37].

Tetracycline Antibiotics with Nicotinamide: The combination of tetracycline (or doxycycline) and nicotinamide (a form of vitamin B3) has demonstrated efficacy in mild to moderate BP. Tetracyclines possess anti-inflammatory properties, including inhibition of neutrophil chemotaxis and matrix metalloproteinase activity, while nicotinamide stabilizes mast cells and inhibits lymphokine production. This regimen offers a well-tolerated, low-immunosuppression alternative, particularly advantageous for frail elderly patients, though it may be less potent than corticosteroids for severe disease [35].

The management of AIBDs in the elderly extends beyond pharmacotherapy. **Supportive care** is a critical pillar of treatment. This includes meticulous wound care for erosions and blisters using non-adherent dressings to prevent secondary infection, aggressive pain management, and nutritional support, especially for patients with painful oral erosions who are at high risk for malnutrition. **Multidisciplinary collaboration** is essential; input from dermatologists, geriatricians, ophthalmologists (for MMP), dentists, dietitians, and wound care specialists ensures a comprehensive and holistic approach to patient care. Finally, the treatment plan must be dynamic, with frequent reassessment of disease activity using validated scoring tools and adjustment of therapy based on clinical response and the emergence of adverse effects, always prioritizing the preservation of the patient's overall functional status and quality of life [30].

2. CONCLUSION

The management of blistering disorders in the elderly is a demanding facet of dermatology that requires a synthesis of deep diagnostic acumen and nuanced therapeutic judgment. The physiological decline of the skin's structural integrity, combined with age-related dysregulation of the immune system, creates a unique susceptibility to both autoimmune and non-autoimmune blistering diseases. As demonstrated, bullous pemphigoid stands as the most significant entity due to its high prevalence, while pemphigus vulgaris remains a formidable challenge due to its severity. The diagnostic pathway is unequivocally reliant on a systematic algorithm that begins with a thorough history and physical examination but must be definitively confirmed through histopathology and direct immunofluorescence, with advanced serology providing critical refinement.

Ultimately, the greatest challenge lies not in diagnosis alone, but in the implementation of a safe and effective long-term management strategy. The cornerstone therapies of systemic corticosteroids and adjuvant immunosuppressants, while life-saving, pose a direct threat to the health of an elderly patient through an elevated risk of infection, metabolic complications, and functional decline. Therefore, the modern therapeutic paradigm strongly advocates for a risk-adapted approach. This includes leveraging potent topical corticosteroids for mild-to-moderate disease, employing steroid-sparing agents early in the course of treatment, and reserving advanced biologic therapies like rituximab for severe or refractory cases. The successful management of an elderly patient with a blistering disorder extends beyond prescription; it necessitates vigilant monitoring for adverse effects, proactive supportive care for wounds and nutrition, and, most importantly, a collaborative, multidisciplinary effort that places the patient's overall well-being and quality of life at the forefront of all clinical decisions.

Conflict of interest: none declared

Fund: non-fundable.

REFERENCES

[1] Kolarsick PA, Kolarsick MA, Goodwin C. Anatomy and physiology of the skin. Journal of the Dermatology Nurses' Association. 2011 Jul 1;3(4):203-13

[2] Farage MA, Miller KW, Elsner P, Maibach HI. Characteristics of the aging skin. Advances in wound care. 2013 Feb 1;2(1):5-10.

[3] Baumann L. Skin ageing and its treatment. The Journal of Pathology: A Journal of the Pathological Society of Great Britain and Ireland. 2007 Jan;211(2):241-51.

[4] Schmidt E, Della Torre R, Borradori L. Clinical features and practical diagnosis of bullous pemphigoid. Dermatologic clinics. 2011 Jul 1;29(3):427-38.

[5] Joly P, Litrowski N. Pemphigus group (vulgaris, vegetans, foliaceus, herpetiformis, brasiliensis). Clinics in dermatology. 2011 Jul 1;29(4):432-6.

[6] Chan LS, Ahmed AR, Anhalt GJ, Bernauer W, Cooper KD, Elder MJ, Fine JD, Foster CS, Ghohestani R, Hashimoto T, Hoang-Xuan T. The first international consensus on mucous membrane pemphigoid: definition, diagnostic criteria, pathogenic factors, medical treatment, and prognostic indicators. Archives of dermatology. 2002 Mar 1;138(3):370-9.

[7] Woodley DT, Briggaman RA, O'Keefe EJ, Inman AO, Queen LL, Gammon WR. Identification of the skin basement-membrane autoantigen in epidermolysis bullosa acquisita. New England Journal of Medicine. 1984 Apr 19;310(16):1007-13.

[8] Wallach D. Pyoderma gangrenosum. InNeutrophilic dermatoses 2018 May 3 (pp. 55-83). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

[9] Strowd LC, Taylor SL, Jorizzo JL, Namazi MR. Therapeutic ladder for pemphigus vulgaris: emphasis on achieving complete remission. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology. 2011 Mar 1;64(3):490-4.

[10] Green KJ, Simpson CL. Desmosomes: new perspectives on a classic. Journal of Investigative Dermatology. 2007 Nov 1;127(11):2499-515.

[11] Amagai M. Pemphigus Vulgaris and Its Active. Dermatologic Immunity. 2008 May 26;10:167-81.

[12] Fine JD, Eady RA, Bauer EA, Bauer JW, Bruckner-Tuderman L, Heagerty A, Hintner H, Hovnanian A, Jonkman MF, Leigh I, McGrath JA. The classification of inherited epidermolysis bullosa (EB): Report of the Third International Consensus Meeting on Diagnosis and Classification of EB. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology. 2008 Jun 1;58(6):931-50.

[13] Schmidt E, Zillikens D. Pemphigoid diseases. The Lancet. 2013 Jan 26;381(9863):320-32.

[14] Liu Z, Giudice GJ, Swartz SJ, Fairley JA, Till GO, Troy JL, Diaz LA. The role of complement in experimental bullous pemphigoid. The Journal of clinical investigation. 1995 Apr 1;95(4):1539-44.

[15] Waschke J. The desmosome and pemphigus. Histochemistry and cell biology. 2008 Jul;130(1):21-54.

[16] Uitto J, Richard G. Progress in epidermolysis bullosa: from eponyms to molecular genetic classification. Clinics in dermatology. 2005 Jan 1;23(1):33-40.

[17] Joly P, Baricault S, Sparsa A, Bernard P, Bédane C, Duvert-Lehembre S, Courville P, Bravard P, Rémond B, Doffoel-Hantz V, Bénichou J. Incidence and mortality of bullous pemphigoid in France. Journal of Investigative Dermatology. 2012 Aug 1;132(8):1998-2004.

[18] Schmidt E, Della Torre R, Borradori L. Clinical features and practical diagnosis of bullous pemphigoid. Dermatologic clinics. 2011 Jul 1;29(3):427-38.

[19] Cortés B, Marazza G, Naldi L, Combescure C, Borradori L, Autoimmune Bullous Disease Swiss Study Group. Mortality of bullous pemphigoid in Switzerland: a prospective study. British journal of dermatology. 2011 Aug 1;165(2):368-74.

[20] Bystryn JC, Rudolph JL. Pemphigus. The Lancet. 2005 Jul 2;366(9479):61-73.

[21] Woodley DT, Briggaman RA, O'Keefe EJ, Inman AO, Queen LL, Gammon WR. Identification of the skin basement-membrane autoantigen in epidermolysis bullosa acquisita. New England Journal of Medicine. 1984 Apr 19;310(16):1007-13.

[22] Gupta R, Woodley DT, Chen M. Epidermolysis bullosa acquisita. Clinics in dermatology. 2012 Jan 1;30(1):60-9.

[23] Salmi TT. Dermatitis herpetiformis. Clinical and experimental dermatology. 2019 Oct 1;44(7):728-31.

[24] Zone JJ, Taylor TB, Kadunce DP, Chorzelski TP, Schachner LA, Huff JC, Meyer LJ, Petersen MJ. IgA antibodies in chronic bullous disease of childhood react with a 97 kDa basement membrane zone protein. Journal of investigative dermatology. 1996 Jun 1;106(6):1277-80.

[25] Amagai M. Pemphigus Vulgaris and Its Active. Dermatologic Immunity. 2008 May 26;10:167-81.

[26] Stavropoulos PG, Soura E, Antoniou C. Drug-induced pemphigoid: a review of the literature. Journal of the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology. 2014 Sep;28(9):1133-40.

[27] Gammon WR, Briggaman RA, Inman III AO, Queen LL, Wheeler CE. Differentiating anti-lamina lucida and anti-sublamina densa anti-BMZ antibodies by indirect immunofluorescence on 1.0 M sodium chloride-separated skin. Journal of investigative dermatology. 1984 Feb 1;82(2):139-44.

[28] Sitaru C, Dähnrich C, Probst C, Komorowski L, Blöcker I, Schmidt E, Schlumberger W, Rose C, Stöcker W, Zillikens D. Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay using multimers of the 16th non-collagenous domain of the BP180 antigen for sensitive and specific detection of pemphigoid autoantibodies. Experimental dermatology. 2007 Sep;16(9):770-7.

[29] Ishii K, Amagai M, Hall RP, Hashimoto T, Takayanagi A, Gamou S, Shimizu N, Nishikawa T. Characterization of autoantibodies in pemphigus using antigen-specific enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays with baculovirus-expressed recombinant desmogleins. Journal of Immunology (Baltimore, Md.: 1950). 1997 Aug 15;159(4):2010-7.

[30] Murrell DF, Dick S, Ahmed AR, Amagai M, Barnadas MA, Borradori L, Bystryn JC, Cianchini G, Diaz L, Fivenson D, Hall R. Consensus statement on definitions of disease, end points, and therapeutic response for pemphigus. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology. 2008 Jun 1;58(6):1043-6.

[31] Joly P, Roujeau JC, Benichou J, Picard C, Dreno B, Delaporte E, Vaillant L, D'Incan M, Plantin P, Bedane C, Young P. A comparison of oral and topical corticosteroids in patients with bullous pemphigoid. New England Journal of Medicine. 2002 Jan 31;346(5):321-7.

[32] Martin LK, Werth VP, Villaneuva EV, Murrell DF. A systematic review of randomized controlled trials for pemphigus vulgaris and pemphigus foliaceus. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology. 2011 May 1;64(5):903-8.

[33] Beissert S, Werfel T, Frieling U, Böhm M, Sticherling M, Stadler R, Zillikens D, Rzany B, Hunzelmann N, Meurer M, Gollnick H. A comparison of oral methylprednisolone plus azathioprine or mycophenolate mofetil for the treatment of bullous pemphigoid. Archives of dermatology. 2007 Dec 1;143(12):1536-42.

[34] Beissert S, Mimouni D, Kanwar AJ, Solomons N, Kalia V, Anhalt GJ. Treating pemphigus vulgaris with prednisone and mycophenolate mofetil: a multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. Journal of investigative dermatology. 2010 Aug 1;130(8):2041-8.

[35] Williams HC, Wojnarowska F, Kirtschig G, Mason J, Godec TR, Schmidt E, Chalmers JR, Childs M, Walton S, Harman K, Chapman A. Doxycycline versus prednisolone as an initial treatment strategy for bullous pemphigoid: a pragmatic, non-inferiority, randomised controlled trial. The Lancet. 2017 Apr 22;389(10079):1630-8.

[36] Joly P, Maho-Vaillant M, Prost-Squarcioni C, Hebert V, Houivet E, Calbo S, Caillot F, Golinski ML, Labeille B, Picard-Dahan C, Paul C. First-line rituximab combined with short-term prednisone versus prednisone alone for the treatment of pemphigus (Ritux 3): a prospective, multicentre, parallel-group, open-label randomised trial. The Lancet. 2017 May 20;389(10083):2031-40.

[37] Ahmed AR, Dahl MV. Consensus statement on the use of intravenous immunoglobulin therapy in the treatment of autoimmune mucocutaneous blistering diseases. Archives of dermatology. 2003 Aug 1;139(8):1051-9