



## A REAL-WORLD EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY OF TOFACITINIB OINTMENT IN ADULT PATIENTS WITH ATOPIC DERMATITIS (TOP STUDY)

### Dermatology

Dr Manasi Sawant

Dr Mayur  
Mayabhate

Dr. Akhilesh  
Sharma

### ABSTRACT

**Background:** Atopic dermatitis (AD) is chronic inflammatory skin condition presenting with severe pruritus. AD has significant prevalence among children (15–30%) and adults (2–10%), affecting quality of life. The primary objective of the study is to evaluate the effectiveness of Tofacitinib ointment in improving clinical outcomes in patients with AD, measured by change in Eczema Area and Severity Index (EASI) score from baseline to 4 weeks. **Methodology:** The present study is retrospective, multicentre, observational OPD-based study that included dermatology patients from various centres in India. Patients who fulfilled the following eligibility criteria were included: Adults aged  $\geq 18$  years with AD; patients who were treated with tofacitinib ointment during study period and assessment of EASI score before and after application of treatment. The difference in outcome measures (EASI scores) at 4 weeks relative to baseline was determined using paired t-tests, and percentage improvement in efficacy was calculated based on mean differences. A significance level of  $p < 0.05$  for two-sided test was employed for statistical analysis. **Results:** The study enrolled 4,921 patients with mean age of  $39.97 \pm 13.07$  years; male prevalence was slightly higher than females (53.5% vs. 46.5%). Most patients had moderate AD (49.5%), while 38.7% and 11.8% had mild and severe disease, respectively. Maximum patients received tofacitinib ointment twice daily (60.1%), while 39.9% used it once daily. There was remarkable improvement in level of disease severity among the subjects. The average EASI score dropped from  $30.64 \pm 28.05$  to  $17.04 \pm 20.72$ , which represents a 44.4% decrease after 4 weeks. Most patients tolerated the treatment well. **Conclusion:** The present study shows Tofacitinib as an effective therapeutic option for the management of AD. Owing to its widespread availability, cost-effectiveness, demonstrated clinical efficacy, and manageable safety profile, it may serve as a valuable treatment alternative for adults with moderate-to-severe AD.

### KEYWORDS

Atopic Dermatitis, Tofacitinib, Eczema Area Severity Index (EASI) Score

### INTRODUCTION

Atopic dermatitis (AD) is a chronic inflammatory skin condition presenting with severe pruritus. AD has a significant prevalence among children (15–30%) and adults (2–10%), affecting their quality of life (1). Limited epidemiologic data exist on the AD in India (2). Due to an underlying complex aetiology, AD is attributed to the TH2 polarization associated with the release of cytokines such as IL-31, IL-13, IL-5, IL-4, IL-17, and IL-22. Additionally, in chronic lesions, TH1 cells are released (3).

Moderate to severe AD exhibits resistance to treatment modalities; however, the crucial treatment options include topical calcineurin inhibitors, emollients, phototherapy, and topical corticosteroids (4). Several immunomodulatory drugs, such as azathioprine, cyclosporine, and methotrexate, have demonstrated varied effectiveness in refractory AD. Newer targeted therapies have been introduced following the appropriate understanding of AD pathogenesis (5).

Personalized medical intervention is required to manage AD and achieve desirable outcomes (6). One such medication is Tofacitinib, a pan-Janus kinase (JAK) inhibitor that specifically inhibits JAK/1 and JAK/3 pathways, resulting in the suppression of Th1, Th2, Th17, and Th22 cell lines. Tofacitinib has shown beneficial effects in various inflammatory dermatoses. Topical tofacitinib (2% ointment) has gained approval in India for mild to moderate AD (7), but its application is limited to smaller body areas, which restricts its use in moderate and severe AD cases (7).

Several randomized clinical trials have reported the effectiveness and safety of Tofacitinib ointment in the management of AD. Most of the existing studies were limited by a smaller sample size, the inclusion of the patient population that does not completely represent the real-world clinical scenario, and shorter follow-up periods (8). Hence, the present study aims to assess the real-world effectiveness and safety profile of Tofacitinib ointment in AD patients. This will provide novel insights to clinicians and dermatologists to address the gap in knowledge by assessing the real-world implications of the use of Tofacitinib ointment effectiveness and safety profile in AD patients.

### METHODOLOGY

The present study is a retrospective, multicenter, observational OPD-based study that included dermatology patients from various centres in India.

### Study Population

Data was gathered from various centres across India, including clinics, hospitals, and healthcare institutions. Data was collected retrospectively by the dermatologists using a case report form. Appropriate ethical approval was taken from the ethics committee (EC) as per ICMR guidelines for ethical guidelines for biomedical research on human participants. As this is a retrospective study involving de-identified participants who cannot be contacted, a waiver of consent was sought from the ethics committee. Patient identities and personal data remained confidential and accessible only to the investigator's authorized personnel, IEC, and relevant regulatory authorities, as applicable.

Patients who fulfilled the following eligibility criteria were included: Adults aged  $\geq 18$  years diagnosed with AD; patients who were treated with tofacitinib ointment during the study period; and assessment of the Eczema Area and Severity Index (EASI) score before and after application of treatment.

Patients were excluded if they had dermatological conditions or any other systemic conditions that may interfere with the treatment outcomes, such as skin disorders or active infections; those who had undergone treatment with Tofacitinib ointment for less than 4 weeks; and those with incomplete medical records around the effectiveness or safety of topical Tofacitinib ointment.

### Study Objective

The primary objective of the study is to evaluate the effectiveness of Tofacitinib ointment in improving clinical outcomes in patients with atopic dermatitis, measured by the change in EASI score from baseline to 4 weeks.

The secondary objective of the study is to evaluate the safety profile of Tofacitinib ointment in AD patients. Additionally, assess treatment duration, adherence, patient-reported outcomes, and factors influencing the effectiveness and safety of Tofacitinib ointment.

The Eczema Area Severity Index (EASI) score was used to assess the severity and extent of AD (9). The score ranges from 0–72. Score 0 denotes clear or no eczema; Score 0.1 to 1 denotes almost clear; 1.1–7 denotes mild AD; 7.1–21 denotes moderate AD; 21.1–50 denotes severe AD, and  $> 51$  denotes excessively severe disease

### Data Collection

Data was recorded from each center as per the protocol and proforma. Demographic data included age and gender. Clinical assessment included reporting the severity of AD, any other skin conditions, frequency, and duration of application, effectiveness, and safety of tofacitinib ointment application, measured as a change in EASI score.

### Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was done through the use of SPSS software. Descriptive statistics were employed to provide summary information on baseline characteristics, clinical data, and treatments. Age, weight, disease duration, and Eczema Area and Severity Index (EASI) scores were analyzed as continuous variables, thus presented as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD). Categorical variables were reported in terms of frequency and percentage.

The difference in the outcome measures (EASI scores) at 4 weeks relative to baseline was determined using paired t-tests, and the percentage improvement in efficacy was calculated based on mean differences. A significance level of  $p < 0.05$  for a two-sided test was employed for statistical analysis. The correlation between categorical variables (severity, skin types, and areas affected) and the clinicians' evaluation of the outcomes (efficacy and safety) was measured using Pearson Chi-square tests, as well as likelihood ratios where appropriate. The confidence interval for all statistical analyses was set at 95%.

### RESULTS

The study included 4921 subjects. The mean age of the studied population was  $39.97 \pm 13.07$  years old. Slight male prevalence can be noted as well, with 53.5% male patients and 46.5% being female (Table 1). Mean body weight was  $65.99 \pm 13.69$  kg and mean duration of the disease was  $7.28 \pm 3.83$  months.

The predominant form of the disease among all patients in our cohort was a condition characterized by dry skin (54.3%), whereas combination skin is second on the list (23.8%) (Table 2). Majority of patients in our sample did not experience any change related to seasonality (84.4%), yet, among patients that did experience seasonal changes, it occurred during summer (6.7%) and winter (6.6%).

As far as disease severity is concerned, most prevalent were moderate cases (49.5%), with 38.7% having mild cases and 11.8% having a severe form. As for the disease localization, face (17.0%) and neck (15.7%) areas prevailed. Symptoms that have been described by most patients were itching (58.6%), redness (52.9%), and dry skin (51.0%).

The topical application of tofacitinib ointment was prescribed twice daily in 60.1% of the study subjects, and the remaining 39.9% of the study participants were on once-daily topical application of the medication (Table 3).

There was a remarkable improvement in the level of disease severity among the subjects. The average EASI score dropped from  $30.64 \pm 28.05$  to  $17.04 \pm 20.72$ , which represents a 44.4% decrease after 4 weeks (Table 4). The result indicates a considerable efficacy of the therapy,  $p < 0.001$ .

The treatment resulted in positive patient outcomes in most of the study subjects. For instance, 50.6% of the study population had "good" patient outcomes, while 44.4% had "excellent" results. On the other hand, very few patients experienced "fair" (4.7%) and "poor" (0.3%) treatment outcomes (Table 5).

The medication was safe, with 48.8% reporting "excellent" treatment tolerance, and 47.1% reported "good". Additionally, only 0.2% of the patients reported "poor" medication safety (Table 6). None of the study subjects reported adverse effects. Instead, 99.8% of the subjects had no adverse effects during the treatment process (Table 7).

There is evidence of an interaction between the level of efficacy of the treatment and disease severity, skin type, and anatomical distribution of lesions ( $p < 0.001$  for all) (Table 8). This may suggest that certain clinical factors could impact therapeutic efficacy. It was noted that more severe cases resulted in comparatively greater numbers of patients experiencing "excellent" results, while those suffering from moderately severe conditions often experienced "good" results. Such observations could imply that the severity of disease affects treatment outcomes. In addition, the skin type of the patient affected the outcome; patients with dry skin showed comparatively better results,

implying the effect of skin-related properties on therapy efficacy. Finally, there is evidence that the anatomical distribution of lesions influenced the efficacy of the treatments. Certain areas, such as the face, back, and chest, resulted in comparatively greater numbers of excellent outcomes.

There is statistical significance in the relationships between safety results and disease severity, skin type, and body locations involved ( $p < 0.001$  for all) (Table 9). This implies that patient and disease factors may determine the safety of the treatment process. Those patients who had severe conditions had better safety rates than those with other severities, meaning the treatment process might not be the same for other severity types. Skin type was also found to affect the safety rate, where dry skin and sensitive skin were among those with good safety ratings, showing that skin type may have contributed to the treatment process. Safety ratings were quite good regardless of body location, with certain locations like the face, back, and chest having better rates compared to others.

**Table 1. Demographic and Baseline Characteristics**

| Variable                     | Value             |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| N                            | 4921              |
| Age (years)                  | $39.97 \pm 13.07$ |
| Gender                       |                   |
| Female, n (%)                | 2286 (46.5)       |
| Male, n (%)                  | 2635 (53.5)       |
| Weight (kg)                  | $65.99 \pm 13.69$ |
| Duration of disease (months) | $7.28 \pm 3.83$   |

**Table 2. Clinical Characteristics of Atopic Dermatitis**

| Domain                | Category             | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Skin Type             | Combination          | 1170          | 23.8           |
|                       | Dry                  | 2671          | 54.3           |
|                       | Oily                 | 771           | 15.7           |
|                       | Sensitive            | 309           | 6.3            |
| Seasonal Variation    | No variation         | 4151          | 84.4           |
|                       | Autumn exacerbation  | 13            | 0.3            |
|                       | Monsoon exacerbation | 101           | 2.1            |
|                       | Summer exacerbation  | 332           | 6.7            |
|                       | Winter exacerbation  | 324           | 6.6            |
| Severity of Condition | Mild                 | 1904          | 38.7           |
|                       | Moderate             | 2438          | 49.5           |
|                       | Severe               | 579           | 11.8           |
| Areas Affected        | Face                 | 839           | 17.0           |
|                       | Neck                 | 775           | 15.7           |
|                       | Legs                 | 638           | 13.0           |
|                       | Arms                 | 612           | 12.4           |
|                       | Back                 | 601           | 12.2           |
|                       | Chest                | 557           | 11.3           |
|                       | Scalp                | 443           | 9.0            |
|                       | Abdomen              | 375           | 7.6            |
|                       | Genital              | 78            | 1.6            |
|                       | Other                | 3             | 0.1            |
| Presenting Complaints | Itching              | 2886          | 58.6           |
|                       | Redness              | 2605          | 52.9           |
|                       | Dry skin             | 2509          | 51.0           |
|                       | Rash                 | 2245          | 45.6           |
|                       | Inflammation         | 1613          | 32.8           |
|                       | Scaling / Flaking    | 927           | 18.8           |
|                       | Lichenification      | 162           | 3.3            |

**Table 3. Treatment Regimen (Tofacitinib Ointment Usage)**

| Frequency of Application | n (%)       |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| Once daily               | 1964 (39.9) |
| Twice daily              | 2957 (60.1) |

**Table 4. Change in Eczema Area and Severity Index (EASI) Scores (Baseline vs After 4 Weeks)**

| Parameter             | Mean $\pm$ SD     | % Reduction | p-value    |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|
| Baseline EASI score   | $30.64 \pm 28.05$ | —           | —          |
| EASI score at 4 weeks | $17.04 \pm 20.72$ | 44.4%       | $<0.001^*$ |

\* p value significant at 95% using paired t test

**Table 5. Clinician's Global Assessment – Effectiveness**

| Category | n (%) |
|----------|-------|
|----------|-------|

|           |             |
|-----------|-------------|
| Excellent | 2184 (44.4) |
| Good      | 2490 (50.6) |
| Fair      | 231 (4.7)   |
| Poor      | 16 (0.3)    |

**Table 6. Clinician's Global Assessment – Safety**

|           |             |
|-----------|-------------|
| Category  | n (%)       |
| Excellent | 2403 (48.8) |

|      |             |
|------|-------------|
| Good | 2318 (47.1) |
| Fair | 190 (3.9)   |
| Poor | 10 (0.2)    |

**Table 7. Adverse Events**

|                   |             |
|-------------------|-------------|
| Category          | n (%)       |
| No adverse events | 4910 (99.8) |
| Yes               | 11 (0.2)    |

**Table 8. Factors Influencing Treatment Effectiveness (Clinician's Global Assessment – Effectiveness)**

| Domain         | Category    | Excellent n (%) | Good n (%)  | Fair n (%) | Poor n (%) | Total | p-value |
|----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------|---------|
| Severity       | Mild        | 882 (46.3)      | 972 (51.1)  | 49 (2.6)   | 1 (0.1)    | 1904  | <0.001* |
|                | Moderate    | 949 (38.9)      | 1340 (55.0) | 139 (5.7)  | 10 (0.4)   | 2438  |         |
|                | Severe      | 353 (61.0)      | 178 (30.7)  | 43 (7.4)   | 5 (0.9)    | 579   |         |
| Skin Type      | Combination | 410 (35.0)      | 670 (57.3)  | 84 (7.2)   | 6 (0.5)    | 1170  | <0.001* |
|                | Dry         | 1324 (49.6)     | 1263 (47.3) | 79 (3.0)   | 5 (0.2)    | 2671  |         |
|                | Oily        | 302 (39.2)      | 410 (53.2)  | 54 (7.0)   | 5 (0.6)    | 771   |         |
| Areas Affected | Sensitive   | 148 (47.9)      | 147 (47.6)  | 14 (4.5)   | 0 (0.0)    | 309   | <0.001* |
|                | Abdomen     | 160 (42.7)      | 184 (49.1)  | 27 (7.2)   | 4 (1.1)    | 375   |         |
|                | Arms        | 216 (35.3)      | 367 (60.0)  | 28 (4.6)   | 1 (0.2)    | 612   |         |
|                | Back        | 325 (54.1)      | 248 (41.3)  | 27 (4.5)   | 1 (0.2)    | 601   |         |
|                | Chest       | 287 (51.5)      | 235 (42.2)  | 33 (5.9)   | 2 (0.4)    | 557   |         |
|                | Face        | 416 (49.6)      | 400 (47.7)  | 21 (2.5)   | 2 (0.2)    | 839   |         |
|                | Genital     | 27 (34.6)       | 47 (60.3)   | 2 (2.6)    | 2 (2.6)    | 78    |         |
|                | Legs        | 250 (39.2)      | 365 (57.2)  | 22 (3.4)   | 1 (0.2)    | 638   |         |
|                | Neck        | 324 (41.8)      | 409 (52.8)  | 41 (5.3)   | 1 (0.1)    | 775   |         |
|                | Other       | 0 (0.0)         | 3 (100)     | 0 (0.0)    | 0 (0.0)    | 3     |         |
|                | Scalp       | 179 (40.4)      | 232 (52.4)  | 30 (6.8)   | 2 (0.5)    | 443   |         |

\* p-values is considered significant at 95% CI and represent overall association between each domain and treatment effectiveness through Pearson's Chi-square test.

**Table 9. Factors Influencing Safety (Clinician's Global Assessment – Safety)**

| Domain         | Category    | Excellent n (%) | Good n (%)  | Fair n (%) | Poor n (%) | Total | p-value |
|----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------|---------|
| Severity       | Mild        | 940 (49.4)      | 921 (48.4)  | 40 (2.1)   | 3 (0.2)    | 1904  | <0.001* |
|                | Moderate    | 1095 (44.9)     | 1226 (50.3) | 112 (4.6)  | 5 (0.2)    | 2438  |         |
|                | Severe      | 368 (63.6)      | 171 (29.5)  | 38 (6.6)   | 2 (0.3)    | 579   |         |
| Skin Type      | Combination | 452 (38.6)      | 643 (55.0)  | 70 (6.0)   | 5 (0.4)    | 1170  | <0.001* |
|                | Dry         | 1448 (54.2)     | 1167 (43.7) | 54 (2.0)   | 2 (0.1)    | 2671  |         |
|                | Oily        | 334 (43.3)      | 384 (49.8)  | 50 (6.5)   | 3 (0.4)    | 771   |         |
| Areas Affected | Sensitive   | 169 (54.7)      | 124 (40.1)  | 16 (5.2)   | 0 (0.0)    | 309   | <0.001* |
|                | Abdomen     | 165 (44.0)      | 185 (49.3)  | 25 (6.7)   | 0 (0.0)    | 375   |         |
|                | Arms        | 259 (42.3)      | 337 (55.1)  | 16 (2.6)   | 0 (0.0)    | 612   |         |
|                | Back        | 330 (54.9)      | 245 (40.8)  | 23 (3.8)   | 3 (0.5)    | 601   |         |
|                | Chest       | 299 (53.7)      | 226 (40.6)  | 29 (5.2)   | 3 (0.5)    | 557   |         |
|                | Face        | 476 (56.7)      | 339 (40.4)  | 23 (2.7)   | 1 (0.1)    | 839   |         |
|                | Genital     | 33 (42.3)       | 42 (53.8)   | 3 (3.8)    | 0 (0.0)    | 78    |         |
|                | Legs        | 274 (42.9)      | 347 (54.4)  | 17 (2.7)   | 0 (0.0)    | 638   |         |
|                | Neck        | 367 (47.4)      | 377 (48.6)  | 29 (3.7)   | 2 (0.3)    | 775   |         |
|                | Other       | 3 (100)         | 0 (0.0)     | 0 (0.0)    | 0 (0.0)    | 3     |         |
|                | Scalp       | 197 (44.5)      | 220 (49.7)  | 25 (5.6)   | 1 (0.2)    | 443   |         |

\* p-values is considered significant at 95% CI and represent overall association between each domain and treatment effectiveness through Pearson's Chi-square test.

## DISCUSSION

The present study demonstrates the effectiveness and safety of tofacitinib ointment in the treatment of AD. The demographic predominantly consisted of middle-aged individuals with a slight male preponderance. Clinical characteristics of AD showed that the majority of the patients had dry skin type, followed by combination skin type, and most of them did not experience any change related to seasonality, with moderate to mild severity of AD.

Most AD patients were prescribed tofacitinib ointment twice daily, with the remaining patients receiving the medication once daily via topical application. A statistically significant association was reported between treatment efficacy and disease severity, skin type, and the anatomical distribution of lesions ( $p < 0.001$  for all comparisons). Severe AD cases resulted in comparatively greater numbers of patients experiencing "excellent" results, while those suffering from moderately severe AD conditions often experienced "good" results, denoting that the severity of disease affects treatment outcomes. Patients with dry skin showed comparatively better results, implying the effect of skin-related properties on therapy efficacy. The effectiveness of the treatments was impacted by the anatomical distribution of lesions. Certain regions, like the chest, back, and face,

showed relatively excellent results compared to other affected areas. Similarly, a statistically significant association was reported between safety results and disease severity, skin type, and body locations involved ( $p < 0.001$  for all). Patients with severe AD types reported superior safety outcomes compared to other types of AD. Patients with dry and sensitive skin demonstrated favorable safety outcomes, suggesting that skin type potentially affects treatment tolerability.

In the present study, AD disease severity levels improved significantly after 4 weeks of tofacitinib ointment application; the average EASI score decreased by 44.4%, indicating significant efficacy of the therapy ( $p < 0.001$ ). The clinician's overall assessment of the treatment's efficacy revealed excellent and good patient outcomes with a tolerable and safe profile. Similarly, in another study (10), eyebrows and eyelashes were the most commonly affected areas in AD patients, with symptoms including allergic rhinitis and eczema. In this study, patients had previously received systemic corticosteroid therapy; however, treatment was subsequently discontinued due to disease recurrence and corticosteroid-associated adverse effects. The duration of tofacitinib administration varied across several studies. For example, in a study, a significant improvement in AD symptoms was reported with a reduction of ~66.67% from baseline (10).

Management of AD has posed several challenges for many dermatologists. Systemic immunomodulators (azathioprine, cyclosporine, and methotrexate) are recommended by Indian

guidelines for patients with severe or resistant AD (4). The effectiveness of topical tofacitinib has been investigated in the literature. A randomized controlled trial (RCT) found that 69 adult patients with mild to moderate AD who used topical tofacitinib ointment (2%) for 4-weeks showed a significant improvement in EASI score (11). The reduction in EASI score from the baseline in the placebo group (vehicle ointment) versus in patients with topical tofacitinib was 29.9% and 81.7%, respectively. This highlights the suitability and safe tolerability of the ointment in AD patients (11). In another study (8), topical tofacitinib application twice daily for 4 weeks resulted in complete AD remission, highlighting that the medication was effective in the treatment of refractory eczema. Another study (1) found that topical tofacitinib application twice daily for 6 months showed significant improvement in EASI score (reduced by 62.5% from baseline), clinical symptoms in AD patients. Similarly, another study found that in AD patients who were resistant to multiple systemic agents, administration of 5-10 mg of tofacitinib over 8 weeks helped to attain an EASI score of 90% (7). Most of the existing studies investigated the role of tofacitinib in alleviating pruritus from baseline to six months.

In the present study, the face and neck were the most commonly affected areas, with patients reporting itching, redness, and dry skin as the predominant presenting complaints. Similarly, in another study, the most prevalent symptoms in AD patients were pruritus. Tofacitinib overcomes pruritus as it mitigates the overexpression of IL-13 and IL-4 by targeting JAK signalling (12).

The present study demonstrates that patients suffering from mild to moderate AD reported that tofacitinib ointment helped alleviate their symptoms. Currently available treatment options, including topical calcineurin inhibitors (TCIs) and topical corticosteroids (TCSs) are often unsuitable for application on sensitive anatomical sites such as the face, genital areas, and groin, thereby limiting effective symptom management in these regions (4,13). Tofacitinib offers a promising therapeutic alternative by enabling targeted and potentially safer application to these challenging areas.

The underlying etiology and pathogenesis of AD are multifactorial, involving a complex interplay of environmental, genetic, and immunological factors (14,15). AD initiation is dependent on the release of several cytokines such as IL-4, IL-13, and IL-31 (14). Cytokines and several growth factors use the activator of transcription (STAT) and JAK signal transducer pathway for signal transduction (15). Tofacitinib effectively inhibits cytokines, leading to the diminution of JAK-STAT signalling in keratinocytes (16).

Although several JAK inhibitors, including abrocitinib, ruxolitinib, and upadacitinib, have been investigated for the management of AD, direct head-to-head comparative data among these agents, particularly involving tofacitinib, remain limited. Consequently, there is insufficient evidence to guide clinicians in selecting the most appropriate JAK inhibitor for the treatment of AD (17). While JAKi are effective and cost-effective, further trials within the class and with existing systemic agents are required. Aside from a promising efficacy profile, tofacitinib offers a safe and well-tolerated option in mild to moderate AD patients over the course of 4 weeks (18).

The present study had several strengths. The retrospective study provides real-world evidence on the effectiveness and safety profile of tofacitinib ointment in AD patients. A large sample size (n=4921) offers meaningful insights to comprehensively assess the association of clinically relevant parameters, including disease severity, skin type, and anatomical distribution of lesions, and treatment outcome with the medication. Furthermore, clinician-reported global assessments strengthened the clinical relevance and applicability of the study findings. The findings demonstrate the effectiveness and tolerability of therapy in sensitive and commonly affected areas, especially in all skin types of AD patients, which has been lacking in previous studies.

Certain limitations of the study need to be acknowledged. Firstly, a relatively short follow-up duration (4 weeks) limits the assessment of long-term effectiveness and sustained safety outcomes of tofacitinib ointment in AD patients. Secondly, the majority of the patients had mild-to-moderate AD, thereby limiting the generalizability of the findings to severe or refractory cases. Thirdly, a lack of assessment of potential confounding factors, including prior treatments, environmental influences, and skincare practices, affects the overall findings of the treatment response with tofacitinib. Further, larger

multicentric RCTs with longer follow-up periods are required to validate the effectiveness and safety response in AD patients.

## CONCLUSION

The present study shows tofacitinib to be an effective therapeutic option for the management of AD. Owing to its widespread availability, cost-effectiveness, demonstrated clinical efficacy, and manageable safety profile, it may serve as a valuable treatment alternative for adults with moderate-to-severe AD, particularly in patients where dupilumab or cyclosporine are contraindicated, ineffective, or inaccessible. Nevertheless, larger prospective, long-term RCTs are warranted to further establish its efficacy and long-term safety profile.

## Acknowledgements

Authors would like to thank to Dr. Gunjan Chauhan, founder of Professional Writer.

**Funding:** No funding sources

**Conflict of Interest:** None declared

**Ethical Approval:** The study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee

## REFERENCES

- Dhar S, De A, Sarda A, Godse K, Lahiri K. Real-World Efficacy and Safety of Oral Tofacitinib in Patients with Refractory Moderate to Severe Atopic Dermatitis: A Multicenter Retrospective Study. *Indian Journal of Dermatology*. 2024 Jul;69(4):292–5. doi:10.4103/ijd.ijd\_843\_22
- Vaidyanathan V, Sarda A, De A, Dhar S. Atopy patch test. *Indian J Dermatol Venereol Leprol*. 2019;85(3):338. doi:10.4103/ijdv.IJDVL\_397\_17
- Dhar S, Kanwar A. Epidemiology and clinical pattern of atopic dermatitis in a North Indian pediatric population. *Pediatr Dermatol*. 1998 Sep;15(5):347–51. doi:10.1046/j.1525-1470.1998.1998015347.x
- Rajagopalan M, De A, Godse K, Krupa Shankar DS, Zawar V, Sharma N, et al. Guidelines on Management of Atopic Dermatitis in India: An Evidence-Based Review and an Expert Consensus. *Indian Journal of Dermatology*. 2019 May;64(3):166–81. doi:10.4103/ijd.IJD\_683\_18
- Dhar S, De A, Srinivas SM. Real-World Effectiveness and Safety of Dupilumab for the Treatment of Moderate to Severe Atopic Dermatitis in Indian Patients: A Multi Center Retrospective Study. *Indian Journal of Dermatology*. 2021 May;66(3):297–301. doi:10.4103/ijd.ijd\_860\_20
- Cabanillas B, Brehler AC, Novak N. Atopic dermatitis phenotypes and the need for personalized medicine. *Current Opinion in Allergy & Clinical Immunology*. 2017 Aug;17(4):309–15. doi:10.1097/ACI.0000000000000376
- Sardana K, Sharath S, Meena SK, Khurana A, Dhir B. A Real-World Study of Tofacitinib in Indian Patients with Refractory Moderate-to-Severe Atopic Dermatitis, its Economic Considerations and Immunological Rationale. *Indian Dermatology Online Journal*. 2025 May;16(3):420–5. doi:10.4103/idoj.idoj\_665\_24
- Pramanik A, Panda AK, Panda M, Jena AK. The safety and efficacy of tofacitinib in 16 patients with adult-onset atopic dermatitis – a single-center experience. *IJSA*. 2026 Mar 18;5:74–9. doi:10.25259/IJSA\_71\_2025
- Hanifin JM, Baghoomian V, Grinich E, Leshem YA, Jacobson M, Simpson EL. The Eczema Area and Severity Index—A Practical Guide. *Dermatitis*. 2022 May;33(3):187–92. doi:10.1097/DER.0000000000000895
- Lin W, Zhang F, Lv S, Wang Y, Yang D. Efficacy and safety of tofacitinib in patients with total and universal alopecia- A retrospective evaluation of 69 patients. *IJDVL*. 2025 Mar 24;0:1–5. doi:10.25259/IJDVL\_1755\_2024
- Bissonnette R, Papp KA, Poulin Y, Gooderham M, Raman M, Mallbris L, et al. Topical tofacitinib for atopic dermatitis: a phase II a randomized trial. *Br J Dermatol*. 2016 Nov;175(5):902–11. doi:10.1111/bjd.14871
- Legat FJ. Itch in Atopic Dermatitis – What Is New? *Front Med*. 2021 May 7;8:644760. doi:10.3389/fmed.2021.644760
- Freitas E, Gooderham M, Torres T. New Topical Therapies in Development for Atopic Dermatitis. *Drugs*. 2022 Jun;82(8):843–53. doi:10.1007/s40265-022-01722-2
- Bao L, Zhang H, Chan LS. The involvement of the JAK-STAT signaling pathway in chronic inflammatory skin disease atopic dermatitis. *JAK-STAT*. 2013 Jul 15;2(3):e24137. doi:10.4161/jkst.24137
- Leung DY, Bieber T. Atopic dermatitis. *The Lancet*. 2003 Jan;361(9352):151–60. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(03)12193-9
- Krueger J, Clark JD, Suárez-Fariñas M, Fuentes-Duculan J, Cueto I, Wang CQ, et al. Tofacitinib attenuates pathologic immune pathways in patients with psoriasis: A randomized phase 2 study. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*. 2016 Apr;137(4):1079–90. doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2015.12.1318
- Dai YX, Chen CC. Tofacitinib therapy for children with severe alopecia areata. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*. 2019 Apr;80(4):1164–6. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2018.12.041
- Chaturvedi AR, Zaveri HG, Patel DV, Tof-O in AD Trial Investigators. Topical Tofacitinib for Atopic Dermatitis – Outcomes from Randomized Phase 3 Clinical Trial: First Approval. *Indian Journal of Dermatology*. 2026 Jan;71(1):44–50. doi:10.4103/ijd.ijd\_197\_24