AN OBSERVATIONAL STUDY ON THE MANAGEMENT OF ROSACEA IN PRIVATE PRACTICE

INTRODUCTION

Rosacea is a chronic skin disease which requires long-term therapy. Due to the high risk of relapse, continued topical use is recommended as maintenance therapy. The aim of this observational study was to evaluate the management of rosacea by dermatologists in private practice.

RESULTS

94% of the patients demonstrated stage 1 or stage 2 rosacea. Their mean age was 49 +/- 13 years. 71% had skin type II and 16% skin type III. 16% had a predominantly outdoor lifestyle and 20% were smokers. The longer the length of the rosacea, the higher the severity of the disease.

Patients' characteristics at baseline according to the stages of Rosacea					N=				
	Rosacea	Gender		Age		Ocular rosacea		Duration of the disease (year)	TOPICAL TH Metronidaz
	Stage (n=605)	F	М	<50	≥50	Yes	No	mean ± SD	. Erythromyc . Clindamyci
F	Pre-rosacea (n=28)	75%	25%	46%	54%	0%	100%	8 ± 11	Other ORAL ANTIE Doxycyclin
	Stage 1 (n=408)	80%	20%	52%	48%	4,6%	95,4%	12 ± 11	 Minocyclin Lymecyclin Other
	Stage 2 (n=166)	70%	30%	44%	56%	1,2%	98,8%	11 ± 10	OTHER TRE Isotretinoin Ichtyol
	Stage 3 (n=3)	67%	33%	33%	67%	0%	100%	31 ± 26	PROCEDUR . Electrocoag . Vascular las . IPL . Other
	Total	77%	23%	50%	50%	3,5%	96,5%	11 ± 11	Dermocosme

At V1, dermatologists either prescribed a new treatment or asked patients to continue their current treatment. We noticed that between V1 and V2, dermatologists usually recommended the following possible treatment options: no Rx treatment and only application of a dermocosmetic product to their patients with very mild rosacea (Pre-rosacea stage), one treatment, usually a topical antibiotic to their patients with mild rosacea (stage 1) and one to three treatments (mainly a topical antibiotic or a combination of topical and oral antibiotic with or without a procedure) to their patients with moderate rosacea (stage 2).



CONCLUSION

This study highlights the importance of early management to treat the physical and psychological impairments in patients suffering from rosacea as well as the efficacy of an Rx treatment regimen that includes the use of a well tolerated dermocosmetic to achieve optimal results.

At baseline (before V1), 66% of the rosacea patients were currently undergoing a medical treatment (38%) applied a topical Rx treament of which 30% used the topical Rx Metronidazol). In around 40% of the cases, patients also applied a dermocosmetic product in conjunction with the Rx topical treatment.

S. SEITE

La Roche-Posay Dermatological Laboratories, Asnières, France

During this study, dermatologists practicing in Germany, Slovakia and Canada we management of 614 patients suffering from Rosacea (n=210, 247 and 157 respectiv containing information about patient's characteristics, severity of the pathology therapy was completed by dermatologists at baseline and 2 months later.

Current treatment N=406 (66%)	n	(%)
PICAL THERAPY:	231	38%
tronidazol	186	30%
elaic acid	26	4%
/thromycin	16	3%
ndamycin	5	1%
her	19	3%
AL ANTIBIOTIC:	63	10%
xycyclin	34	5,5%
nocyclin	12	2%
mecyclin	0	0%
her	16	3%
IER TREATMENT:	72	12%
otretinoin	12	16%
tyol	40	55%
OCEDURE:	116	19%
ectrocoagulation	2	0,3%
scular laser	25	4%
_	53	9%
ner	43	7%
mocosmetics	239	39 %

All the prescribed therapeutic programs are efficacious, given that all the clinical symtoms evaluated are significantly reduced between the 2 visits.



Mean score of a 5 points scale from 0 (absent) to 4 (very severe) ^{}R=responsiveness or percentage of responders [#]p<0.0001 between both visits

Most patients presented a physical impairment at baseline (V1). All physical impairments were significantly improved between the 2 visits.



The social impact of the disease was not as important as the physical and psychosocial impacts. Nevertheless all these social impairments are also signifcantly improved between the 2 visits.

Interference with the sex life	
Interference with the relationship	
Relationships affected	
Tendency to stay at home	
Problem for the loved ones	
Displays of affec- tions made difficult	
Tendancy to do things alone Willingness to spend	
time with others	
troubled Social life	
impacted) D 10

METHODS

Score V1 (mean ± SD)	Score V2* (mean ± SD)	R** (%)
1,66 ± 0,89	1,30 ± 0,80 [#]	34%
1,90 ± 0,79	1,38 ± 0,75 [#]	48%
1,62 ± 0,81	1,29 ± 0,70 [#]	31%
$0,81 \pm 0,89$	0,49 ± 0,69 [#]	32%
$0,88 \pm 0,99$	0,50 ± 0,72 [#]	36%
0,93 ± 0,97	0,50 ± 0,71 [#]	38%
1,27 ± 1,06	0,89 ± 0,84 [#]	35%
1,12 ± 0,99	0,60 ± 0,74 [#]	44%
1,42 ± 1,01	0,61 ± 0,76#	62%
11,66 ± 5,00	7,61 ± 4,28#	
	$(mean \pm SD)$ $1,66 \pm 0,89$ $1,90 \pm 0,79$ $1,62 \pm 0,81$ $0,81 \pm 0,89$ $0,88 \pm 0,99$ $0,93 \pm 0,97$ $1,27 \pm 1,06$ $1,12 \pm 0,99$ $1,42 \pm 1,01$	(mean \pm SD)(mean \pm SD)1,66 \pm 0,891,30 \pm 0,80#1,90 \pm 0,791,38 \pm 0,75#1,62 \pm 0,811,29 \pm 0,70#0,81 \pm 0,890,49 \pm 0,69#0,88 \pm 0,990,50 \pm 0,72#0,93 \pm 0,970,50 \pm 0,71#1,27 \pm 1,060,89 \pm 0,84#1,12 \pm 0,990,60 \pm 0,74#1,42 \pm 1,010,61 \pm 0,76#

Physical impairment

Social Impairment



In all cases, at the second visit patients claim to experience a lower rate of triggering incidents.

Triggering Factor N=614	Score V1 (mean ± SD)	Score V2* (mean ± SD)	R** (%)
Sun	1,61 ± 0,92	1,36 ± 0,88 [#]	25%
Wind	1,28 ± 0,91	1,01 ± 0,80 [#]	25%
Heat	1,64 ± 0,91	1,33 ± 0,84 [#]	29%
Cold	1,34 ± 0,94	1,00 ± 0,84 [#]	31%
Spicy food	0,85 ± 0,93	0,73 ± 0,80 [#]	17%
Hot drinks or food	0,94 ± 0,92	0,80 ± 0,81 [#]	19%
Emotions	1,35 ± 0,96	1,12 ± 0,84 [#]	24%
Coffee	$0,58 \pm 0,86$	0,43 ± 0,68 [#]	16%
Alcohol	1,34 ± 1,07	1,09 ± 0,93 [#]	25%
Intense physical exercise	1,50 ± 0,99	1,23 ± 0,91#	28%
Cosmetic products	$0,84 \pm 0,84$	0,65 ± 0,72 [#]	21%
GLOBAL SCORE (0-33)	13,12 ± 6,20	10,45 ± 5,46#	

*Mean score of a 4 points scale from 0 (never) to 3 (always) **R=responsiveness or percentage of responders [#]p<0,0001 between both visits

Most patients were psychologically affected at baseline (V1) by their skin problem. All these psychological impairments are significantly improved between the 2 visits.

Physiological impairment



All scores at V2 are significantly lower (p<0,0001) versus V1 Percentage of patients (%)

Affected at V1 Affected at V2 Improved between V1 and V2



ere a	asked	about	their
vely).	A q	uestion	naire,
and	d the	preso	cribed