

genitals have been described as likely due to simultaneous transmission or autoinoculation (7).

In general, the morphology of extragenital chancres parallels those on the genitals, although variations occur (3). Cutaneous primary syphilitic lesions can be atypical, often widespread, deeply infiltrated, ulcerated or with impetiginoid or ectimoid features (1, 7–9). The clinical pattern of dactylitis, periungual paronychia and paronychia has been reported on the fingers (7, 10).

The unusual case of extragenital chancre and the variable clinical appearance of chancre on the fingers frequently result in incorrect or delayed diagnosis, because syphilis is rarely suspected in such cases.

Differential diagnosis includes, at first, both clinically and by laboratory procedures, primary complexes of primary cutaneous tuberculosis, cat-scratch disease, tularemia and sporotrichosis. However, primary syphilitic lesions of the fingers must also be distinguished from cutaneous leishmaniasis and atypical mycobacterial skin infections, which sometimes develop a primary complex, as well as staphylococcal lymphangitis and foreign body granulomas (2, 3, 5). Furthermore, viral diseases, lymphomas and cancers with nodal metastasis must also be excluded.

The patient's history may evoke suspicion. The presence of typical lymphadenopathy, as in our report, is helpful when considering the possibility of syphilis. In fact, a papuloulcerative lesion with regional lymphadenopathy should raise one's suspicion of primary syphilis. Where epitrochlear or axillary

adenitis are painless, serological tests for syphilis are indicated (5).

In conclusion, chancre of the fingers can be diagnosed only when the clinician maintains a high index of suspicion of syphilis, "the great simulator".

REFERENCES

1. Alessi E. La sifilide. In: Serri F, ed. Trattato Italiano di Dermatologia. Padova: Piccin Nuova Libreria, 1989; V 107: 1–132.
2. Sanchez MR. Syphilis. In: Fitzpatrick's dermatology in general medicine, 5th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1999: 2551–2581.
3. Chapel TA, Prasad P, Chapel J, Lekas N. Extragenital syphilitic chancres. J Am Acad Dermatol 1985; 13: 582–584.
4. Allison SD. Extragenital syphilitic chancres. J Am Acad Dermatol 1986; 14: 1094.
5. Morton RS. The treponematoses. Syphilis. In: Rook/Wilkinson/Ebling, Champion RH, Burton JL, Burns DA, Breathnach SM, eds, 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell Science, 1998: 1237–1265.
6. Centers for Disease Control. Syphilis. In: 1998 Guidelines for treatment of sexually transmitted diseases. Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 1998; 47/No RR-1: 28–49.
7. Starzycki Z. Primary syphilis of the fingers. Br J Venereol Dis 1983; 59: 169–171.
8. De Koning GAJ, Blog FB, Stolz E. A patient with primary syphilis of the hand. Br J Venereol Dis 1977; 53: 386–388.
9. Labouche F, Hénaff R, Cadere B. Syphilis primo-secondaire; chancre digital à localisation inhabituelle. Bull Soc Fr Dermatol Syph 1967; 74: 154–155.
10. Kingsbury DH, Chester EC Jr, Jansen GT. Syphilitic paronychia: an unusual complaint. Arch Dermatol 1972; 105: 458.

Type 2 Segmental Cutaneous Leiomyomatosis

Arne König and Rudolf Happle

Department of Dermatology, Philipp University, Deutschhausstrasse 9, D-35037 Marburg, Germany. E-mail: koeniga@mailier.uni-marburg.de

Accepted May 16, 2001.

Sir,

We read with interest the report on "zosteriform and disseminated lesions in cutaneous leiomyoma" by Agarwalla et al. (1). We would like to suggest categorizing this case as a type 2 segmental manifestation of cutaneous leiomyomatosis (2). Agarwalla et al. noted a few leiomyomas on their patient's back, and from the title of their report we conclude that these lesions were disseminated, reflecting heterozygosity for the gene of this autosomal dominant trait. By contrast, the agminated leiomyomas on the left side of the chest would reflect an area of skin in which the corresponding wild-type allele has been lost at an early developmental stage, which is why a pronounced involvement is superimposed on the ordinary non-segmental phenotype (3–5). Apparently, early loss of heterozygosity occurs rather frequently in cutaneous leiomyomatosis. At least 9 cases suggesting a type 2 segmental manifestation have previously been documented (2, 5, 6).

REFERENCES

1. Agarwalla A, Thakur A, Jacob M, Joshi A, Garg VK, Agrawal S. Zosteriform and disseminated lesions in cutaneous leiomyoma. Acta Derm Venereol 2000; 80: 446.
2. König A, Happle R. Two cases of type 2 segmental manifestation in a family with cutaneous leiomyomatosis. Eur J Dermatol 2000; 10: 590–592.
3. Happle R. Segmental forms of autosomal dominant skin disorders: different types of severity reflect different states of zygosity. Am J Med Genet 1996; 66: 241–242.
4. Happle R. A rule concerning the segmental manifestation of autosomal dominant skin disorders: review of clinical examples providing evidence for dichotomous types of severity. Arch Dermatol 1997; 133: 1505–1509.
5. Happle R. Loss of heterozygosity in human skin. J Am Acad Dermatol 1999; 41: 143–164.
6. Smith CG, Glaser DA, Leonardi C. Zosteriform multiple leiomyomas. J Am Acad Dermatol 1998; 38: 272–273.

Editors comment: Agarwalla et al. have been given the opportunity to respond to this letter.