Table 1 Characteristics of class 1 and 2 food allergy

	Class 1	Class 2
Sensitization to allergens	Gastrointestinal tract	Respiratory exposure
Age of peak prevalence	Early childhood	After school age
Symptoms	Rapid onset of gastrointestinal responses (nausea, abdominal pain, cramp, vomiting, diarrhea); other target organ responses (e.g., skin, respiratory tract) often involved	Mild pruritus, tingling, and/or angioedema of the lips, palate, tongue or oropharynx; occasional sensation of tightness in the throat and rarely systemic symptoms
Typical foods	Egg, milk, wheat, peanut, fish	Fruit, vegetable
Stable or labile in presence of heat, acid, and proteases	Stable	Labile
Diagnosis	Clinical history and positive SPT responses or CAP-RAST results Oral challenge-positive on double-blinded food-challenge test	Clinical history and positive SPT responses (prick-plus-prick method) Oral challenge-positive with fresh food, negative with cooked food
Treatment	Elimination diet	Elimination diet Foods may become edible by heating Immunotherapy to treat the pollen-induced rhinitis may improve PFS

Table 2 Major fruits and vegetables reported to show cross-reactivity with pollen

Pollen	Food
Birch	Rosaceae (apple, pear, sweet cherry, peach, plum, apricot, almond), Apiaceae (celery, carrot), Solanaceae (potato), Actinidiaceae (kiwifruit), Betulaceae (hazelnut), Anacardiaceae (mango), Chili pepper, etc.
Japanese cedar	Solanaceae (tomato)
Mugwort	Apiaceae (celery, carrot), Anacardiaceae (mango), spice, etc.
Grass	Cucurbitaceae (melon, watermelon), Solanaceae (tomato, potato), Actinidiaceae (kiwifruit), Rutaceae (orange), Fabaceae (peanut), etc.
Ragweed	Cucurbitaceae (melon, watermelon, cantaloupe, zucchini, cucumber), Musaceae (banana), etc.
Plane	Betulaceae (hazelnut), Rosaceae (apple), lettuce, corn, Fabaceae (peanut, chickpea)

CHARACTERISTICS OF OAS: CLASS 1 AND CLASS 2 ALLERGY

Food allergens that induce OAS rapidly dissolve in the oral cavity and are readily broken down by digestive enzymes such as those in gastric juice. Since these food allergens differed in properties from known food allergens that are resistant to digestive enzymes and induce sensitization via the intestine, allergy to proteins in fruits and vegetables cross-reactive with pollen antigen in individuals sensitized by the antigen via the airway began to termed class 2 food allergy[7] to distinguish it from food allergy caused by conventional intestinal sensitization (class 1 food allergy) (Table 1, 2).

DISEASES EXHIBITING OAS

PFS mentioned above is a typical disease that exhibits OAS. In addition to PFS, latex-fruit syndrome (LFS; allergy to fresh fruits or vegetables after sensitization with latex-inhalation antigen in latex powder) has been reported as disease exhibiting OAS. Clinically, also, some patients yielding a positive skin test complain of oral discomfort immediately after the ingestion of egg on the oral challenge test but show no spread of allergic symptoms to the entire body if they continue eating it.

PFS IS NOT EQUAL TO OAS

While the majority of symptoms of PFS are indeed mild, such as the OAS, caution is necessary, because systemic and severe reactions may be observed by some pollen-related food allergens (Api g 1, Gly m 4). The antigens that cause PFS have been extensively studied, particularly in Western countries, and they will be discussed in the next section.

ANTIGENS CAUSING OAS

In Europe, more than 70% of patients with birch pollinosis are allergic to pollen-related food allergens such as the apple, cherry, and hazelnut. Major allergens responsible for these symptoms belong to a group exhibiting high-level homology with Bet v 1, a major antigen of birch pollen (Table 3). The next most frequent is the food allergen showing a high-level homology with Bet v 2 (profilin), another birch pollen antigen. Bet v 5 and 6 are also reportedly involved in cross-reactivity, but most cross-reactivity is related to Bet v 1, and the involvement of other antigens is negligible.[8]

486

- 100 -

Table 3 Major pollen/latex and class 2 food allergens

Pollen/latex allergens		Class 2 food allergens			
Bet v 1 homolog's (Group belonging PR-10)					
Aln g 1 (alder)	Bet v 1 (birch)	Api g 1 (celery)	Ara h 8 (peanut)	Cor a 1 (hazel)	Dau c 1 (carrot)
Car b 1 (hornbeam)	Cas s 1 (chestnut)	Fra a 1 (strawberry)	Gly m 4 (soybean)	Mal d 1 (apple)	Pru ar 1 (apricot)
Cor a 1 (hazelnut)	Que a 1 (white oak)	Pru av 1 (sweet cherry)	Pyr c 1 (pear)	Sol t 1 (potato)	Vig r 1 (mung bean)
Profilin					
Art v 4 (mugwort)	Bet v 2 (birch)	Ana c 1 (pineapple)	Ara h 5 (peanut)	Api g 4 (celery)	Cap a 2 (bell pepper)
Cyn d 12 (Bermuda grass)	Hel a 2 (sunflower)	Cit s 2 (sweet orange)	Cor a 2 (hazel)	Cuc m 2 (muskmelon)	Dau c 4 (carrot)
Ole e 2 (olive)	Phl p 12 (timothy)	Gly m 3 (soybean)	Lit c 1 (lychee)	Lyc e 1 (tomato)	Mal d 4 (apple)
Hev b 8 (latex)		Mus xp 1 (banana)	Pru av 4 (sweet cherry)	Pru p 4 (peach)	Pyr c 4 (pear)

Data from http://fermi.utmb.edu/SDAP/.

Bet v 1 GROUP

Bet v 1 (PR-10) is one of the pathogenesis-related (PR) proteins, which increase in plants when they are exposed to stress. Many foods have been reported to contain this protein, and the cross-reactivity is considered to be derived from the high-level homology of amino acid sequences in this group. The IgE-binding activities of these allergens are readily lost through heat or enzyme treatment. Also, the p-loop (AA41-52) region has been reported to be particularly important in the IgE epitope of Bet v 1.[9]

While many of the symptoms caused by antigens of PR proteins are those of OAS, antigens of celery (Api g 1) and soybean (Gly m 4), which belong to the same group as Bet v 1, have been reported to induce marked systemic symptoms.

Api g 1

Celery allergy is common in Europe (Primarily Switzerland, France, and Germany). In Switzerland, it is reported to be a major cause of food-induced anaphylaxis,[10] and about half of the patients have been reported to show systemic allergic reaction.[11,12] Its allergenicity is not changed markedly by heating. Pollen of birch and mugwort is known to be cross-reactive to celery, and is considered to be a sensitizing antigen.[13] While celery allergens include Api g 4 and Api g 5, the major allergen is Api g 1, which belongs to the above-mentioned PR-10. However, the reason why Api g 1 is stable against heating unlike other allergens belong to the same group as Bet v 1 has not been sufficiently clarified. Wangorsch et al.[14] reported that Api g 1 has 2 isoforms, that Api g 1.01 shows a stronger IgE-binding capacity than Api g 1.02, and that this difference is derived from the fact that the binding site of Api g 1.01 in the above p-loop

region is Lys44 while that of Api g 1.02 or Bet v 1 is Glu45, and suggested the importance of this region.

Gly m 4

In 2002, Kleine-Tabbe et al.[15] reported that 20 patients with birch pollinosis developed allergic symptoms including serious ones after the initial ingestion of soybean protein food. Notable symptoms included swelling of the face (17 patients), OAS (14), dyspnea (6), urticaria (6), and drowsiness (5). They also reported that soybean starvation-associated message 22 (SAM22: Gly m 4), which belongs to PR-10, showed an IgE-binding capacity in 85% (17/20) of the patients. A follow-up study by Mittag et al.[16] confirmed that Gly m 4-specific IgE was positive in 21 of 22 birch pollinosis patients who developed soybean allergy, and that it inhibited the binding of IgE to soybean protein by 60% or more in 9 of 11 patients, indicating that Gly m 4 was the major allergen. Moreover, as the binding of IgE to soybean protein was inhibited by 80% or more by the addition of birch pollen protein in 9 of the 11 patients, they suggested that birch pollen is primarily responsible for the common antigenicity of the two. According to their report, Gly m 4 was not detected in fermentation products such as miso and soy sauce or roasted soybean, but its content was 9 ppm in tofu, 11 ppm in soy flakes, 70 ppm in a dietary powder among soybean-containing food despite its variation with the total soybean content. They also reported that Gly m 4 concentration was markedly affected by the cooking method and that it was reduced by 30-minutes and not detected after 4-hour heating. Three patients with alder/birch pollinosis who developed OAS (1 case) or anaphylaxis (2 cases) after the intake of soymilk have been reported, and an involvement of Gly m 4 is suspected[17] in Japan, too.

Table 4 Lipid transfer protein (LTP); major allergens belonging to PR-14

Inhaled allergens		Food allergens		
Tree	Weed	Fruits/vegetables		Beans/nuts/seeds
Cas s 8 (chestnut)	Art v 3 (mugwort)	Aspa o 1 (asparagus)	Bra o 3 (cabbage)	Cor a 8 (hazelnut)
Pla a 3 (plane tree)	Par j 1 (pellitory)	Cit l 3 (lemon)	Cit s 3 (sweet orange)	Jug r 3 (English walnut)
	Par j 2 (pellitory)	Fra a 3 (strawberry)	Lac s 1 (lettuce)	
	Par o 1 (pellitory)	Lyc e 3 (tomato)	Mal d 3 (apple)	
		Pru ar 3 (apricot)	Pru av 3 (sweet cherry)	
Heb b 12 (latex)		Pru d 3 (European plum)	Pru p 3 (peach)	
		Vit v 1 (grape)	Zea m 14 (maize, corn)	

Data from http://fermi.utmb.edu/SDAP/.

PROFILIN GROUP

Profilin is considered to be an allergen involved in a wide range of cross-reactivities among plants, and patients sensitized with it react with a variety of plants and foods. For example, it is considered responsible for the cross-reactions between birch/mugwort pollen-celery-spices, grass pollen-celery-carrots, and tree pollen-hazelnut. The cross-reactivity of IgE is considered to be due to a structural similarity rather than similarity at the amino acid sequence level.[18] There major IgE epitope have been identified in birch profilin.[19]

Asero et al. performed skin tests in 200 pollinosis patients using purified palm profilin (Pho d 2) and observed positive reaction in one-third of the patients. They were also positive for pollen from a wide range of plants, more than half of them exhibited OAS with symptoms of fruit allergy, and no symptom was induced by cooked or processed foods.[20]

CROSS-REACTIVE CARBOHYDRATE DETERMINANTS (CCD)

Carbohydrates that act as cross-reacting antigens among various plants or invertebrates are collectivity called cross-reactive carbohydrate determinants (CCD).

Carbohydrates with an IgE-binding capacity have also been reported in plant proteins with no allergenicity. They are, for example, bromelain of pineapple, horseradish peroxidase (HRP), polyamine oxidase of corn, ascorbic acid oxidase of Cucurbita pepo, and phytohemagglutinin of haricot bean. Many CCDs are monovalent and do not form bridges of IgEs on the mast cells, and so they are generally considered not to induce histamine release. However, it has been revealed that about half of individuals positive for Ole e 1, a major antigen of Olive pollen, show IgE antibodies to this carbohydrate, and that this carbohy-

drate induces histamine release in them.[21]

Recently, van Ree et al.[22] reported that α1,3-fucose and β1,2-xylose, which are N-linked glycans, have IgE-binding capacities. Individuals are considered to be sensitized when exposed to pollen and thereafter develop cross-reaction to foods. However, only limited individuals with IgE antibodies to CCDs actually develop clinical symptoms, and whether they develop symptoms is speculated to depend on the difference in the glycan number or affinity of IgE antibodies.[23]

LIPID-TRANSFER PROTEINS (LTP) GROUP

Antigens belonging to the LTP family have been reported to exist in a wide variety of fruits, vegetables, and pollen (Table 4).

LTP, belonging to PR-14, exhibit an antigenicity resistant to heating or digestive enzymes and cause fruit allergy even without pollinosis, and the symptoms are not only OAS but also involve severe systemic symptoms at a relatively frequent rate. Therefore, they are presently considered to be non-pollen-related allergens (class 1 food allergens) that act by intestinal sensitization.[24] However, there are data that suggest that LTP is responsible for food allergy associated with pollinosis (class 2 food allergy) in some patients.

Mugwort is known to be a major cause of pollinosis in Mediterranean coastal areas, and Art v 3 is a mugwort pollen antigen belonging to the LTP group. According to a report on cross-reaction between Art v 3 and LTP from peach or apple,[25] whether the cross-reaction was due to sensitization primarily by pollen or peach was unclear. To study this relationship, Pastorello et al.[26] collected 17 patients with peach allergy and compared 10 who had not developed pollinosis and 7 with pollinosis. The 10 patients with no pollinosis reacted with mugwort pollen LTP and peach LTP, but the 7 pollinosis reacted with proteins other than

LTP. Next, the reactions of IgE with mugwort pollen LTP and peach LTP were examined using pooled serum from 10 patients by immunoblot inhibition. IgE binding to the peach 9-kDa band (LTP) was totally inhibited by a small amount of peach LTP but only by 100 times amount of mugwort LTP, whereas a small amount of both mugwort and peach LTP totally inhibited the IgE-binding to mugwort LTP. Therefore, they concluded that this cross-reactivity was primarily due to sensitization by peach LTP (peach class 1 allergy). In contrast, Lombardero et al.[27] considered that the report by Pastorello et al. was biased based on the fact that the patients were mostly those with peach allergy, and performed reevaluation by collecting 24 patients with mugwort pollinosis. They reported that more than 70% of the patients were positive on the skin test to mugwort LTP. They subsequently evaluated the cross-reactivity of mugwort LTP with peach LTP by ELISA inhibition, and reported that IgE binding with peach LTP was inhibited by the addition of mugwort LTP in 3 of 6 studied patients but that IgE binding with mugwort LTP was not inhibited by the addition of peach LTP, suggesting that the common antigenicity of mugwort and peach LTP was primarily due to mugwort pollen in some patients (class 2 food allergy).

OAS IN JAPAN

In Japan, also, there have been reports of OAS due to foods of the family Rosaceae in patients hypersensitive to birch pollen in Hokkaido and Alnus sieboldiana (family Betulaceae, genus Alnus) pollen in Hyogo Prefecture.[28,29]

The frequency of OAS in patients with Japanese cedar pollinosis is lower than that in those with birch pollinosis (75%), being reported to be 7-17%.[30,31] According to questionnaire surveys performed in Japanese cedar pollinosis patients, melon and kiwifruit induced allergy in many of them.

According to our oral questionnaire survey concerning foods causing fruit and vegetable hypersensitivity in patients with Japanese cedar pollinosis (17 respondents with pollinosis and fruit allergy), melon (12/17), kiwi (9/17), tomato (9/17), watermelon (7/17), and pineapple (6/17) were frequently ingested. However, in such a questionnaire survey, reactions to materials with pharmacological actions contained in foods may be misinterpreted by the respondents as allergic symptoms, and food allergy unrelated to Japanese cedar pollinosis may be reported; therefore, the competitiveness for IgE antibody between cedar pollen and fruit or vegetable antigen must be demonstrated.

At first, we identified the main allergens of tomato fruit,[32] then demonstrated the cross-reactivity between tomato fruit and Japanese cedar pollen by RAST inhibition, and further identified the protein responsible for the cross-reactivity by immunoblot inhi-

bition.[33] As a result of comparing the amino acid sequences of these proteins, we clarified the presence of regions showing close agreement, i.e., Cry j 2 of Japanese cedar pollen and PG2A of tomato fruit, and reported the possible involvement of these regions in the competitiveness for IgE. Concerning the common antigenicity of tomato and Japanese cedar pollen, there is a report that symptoms considered to be OAS appeared after the oral ingestion of tomato in a dog model of Japanese cedar pollinosis, establishing the cross-reactivity between Japanese cedar pollen and tomato fruit antigens.[34]

TREATMENT FOR OAS

In PFS due to birch pollinosis, birch pollen-specific immunotherapy has been reported to be effective for the treatment of OAS to related foods.[35,36] Food tolerance and negative skin tests have also been reported to persist for 30 months,[37] and food skin tests converted to positive with the reactivation of OAS symptoms in all patients.

Foods that cause OAS should be avoided, in principle, but pollen-associated foods are often edible when heated. Therefore, the unnecessary elimination of foods should be avoided through close evaluation of the history of allergy due to cooked foods and oral challenge test. There is also a report that symptoms of OAS were significantly alleviated using antihistamines compared with a placebo.[38] Antihistamines might partially relieve symptoms of oral allergy syndrome.

However, some pollen-related foods such as celery and soybean may lead to severe symptoms although they belong to the Bet v 1 group. In LFS, the antigenicity of some foods is not lost by heating, and they tend to cause severe symptoms.

Naturally, PFS may also cause generalized symptoms and even anaphylaxis if a large amount of antigen has been ingested. Therefore, in case of emergency, patients with a history of anaphylaxis should carry a portable epinephrine injection kit, antihistamines, and oral steroids with a medical certificate.

Even if cooked food allergens did not elicit oral allergy syndromes, they may cause T-cell-mediated late-phase reactions (deterioration of atopic eczema) in some birch pollen-allergic patients with atopic dermatitis. Because thermal processing affected their conformational structure and not the primary amino acid sequence. Therefore, the judgment of whether the intake of cooked foods may be permitted should not be made on the basis of the presence or absence of immediate hypersensitivity alone.[39]

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

1. Amlot PL, Kemeny DM, Zachary C, Parkes P, Lessof MH. Oral allergy syndrome (OAS): symptoms of IgE-mediated hypersensitivity to foods. *Clin Allergy* 1897;**17**:33-42.

2. Ortolani C, Ispano M, Pastorello E, Bigi A, Ansaloni R. The oral allergy syndrome. *Ann Allergy* 1988;**61**:47-52.

3. Liccardi G, D'Amato G. Oral allergy syndrome in a subject with a highly relevant monosensitization to egg. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1994;**94**:931-2.

4. Kelso JM. Oral allergy syndrome? *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1995;**96**:275.

5. Valenta R, Kraft D. Type I allergic reactions to plant-derived food: A consequence of primary sensitization to pollen allergens. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1996;**97**:893-5.

6. Ma S, Sicherer SH, Nowak-Wegrzyn A. A survey on the management of pollen-food allergy syndrome in allergy practices. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2003;**112**:784-8.

7. Breiteneder H, Ebner C. Molecular and biochemical classification of plant-derived food allergens. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2000;**106**:27-36.

8. Wensing M, Akkerdaas JH, van Leeuwen WA *et al*. IgE to Bet v 1 and profilin: Cross-reactivity patterns and clinical relevance. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2002;**110**:435-42.

9. Mirza O, Henriksen A, Ipsen H *et al*. Dominant epitopes and allergic cross-reactivity: complex formation between a Fab fragment of a monoclonal murine IgG antibody and the major allergen from birch pollen Bet v 1. *J Immunol* 2000;**165**:331-8.

10. Rohrer CL, Pichler WJ, Helbling A. [Anaphylaxis: clinical aspects, etiology and course in 118 patients]. *Schweiz Med Wochenschr* 1998;**128**:53-63 (in German).

11. Ballmer-Weber BK, Vieths S, Luttkopf D, Heuschmann P, Wuthrich B. Celery allergy confirmed by double-blind, placebo-controlled food challenge: a clinical study in 32 subjects with a history of adverse reactions to celery root. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2000;**106**:373-8.

12. Luttkopf D, Ballmer-Weber BK, Wuthrich B, Vieths S. Celery allergens in patients with positive double-blind placebo-controlled food challenge. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2000;**106**:390-9.

13. Breiteneder H, Hoffmann-Sommergruber K, O'Riordain G *et al*. Molecular characterization of Api g 1, the major allergen of celery (*Apium graveolens*), and its immunological and structural relationships to group of 17-kDa tree pollen allergens. *Eur J Biochem* 1995;**233**:484-9.

14. Wangorsch A, Ballmer-Weber BK, Rosch P, Holzhauser T, Vieths S. Mutational epitope analysis and cross-reactivity of two isoforms of Api g 1, the major celery allergen. *Mol Immunol* 2007;**44**:2518-27.

15. Kleine-Tabbe J, Vogel L, Crowell DN, Haustein UF, Vieths S. Severe oral allergy syndrome and anaphylactic reactions caused by a Bet v 1-related PR-10 protein in soybean, SAM22. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2002;**110**:797-804.

16. Mittag D, Vieths S, Vogel L *et al*. Soybean allergy in patients allergic to birch pollen: Clinical investigation and molecular characterization of allergens. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2004;**113**:148-54.

17. Harada S, Nakamura A, Matsunaga A *et al*. Three cases of soy milk allergy. *J Environ Dermatol Cutan Allergol* 2007;**1**:31-8.

18. Rihs HP, Chen Z, Rueff F *et al*. IgE binding of the recombinant allergen soybean profilin (rGly m 3) is mediated by conformational epitopes. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1999;**104**:1293-301.

19. Fedorov AA, Ball T, Mahoney NM *et al*. The molecular basis for allergen cross-reactivity: crystal structure and IgE-epitope mapping of birch pollen profilin. *Structure* 1997;**5**:33-45.

20. Asero R, Monsalve R, Barber D. Profilin sensitization detected in the office by skin prick test: a study of prevalence and clinical relevance of profilin as a plant food allergen. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2008;**38**:1033-7.

21. Batanero E, Crespo JF, Monsalve RI *et al*. IgE-binding and histamine-release capabilities of the main carbohydrate component isolated from the major allergen of olive tree pollen, Ole e 1. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1999;**103**:147-53.

22. van Ree R, Cabanes-Macheteau M, Akkerdaas J *et al*. $\beta(1,2)$-xylose and $\alpha(1,3)$-fucose residues have a strong contribution in IgE binding to Glycoallergens. *J Biol Chem* 2000;**275**:11451-8.

23. van Ree R. Carbohydrate epitopes and their relevance for the diagnosis and treatment of allergic diseases. *Int Arch Allergy Immunol* 2002;**129**:189-97.

24. Van Ree R. Clinical importance of non-specific lipid transfer proteins as food allergens. *Biochem Soc Trans* 2002; **30**:910-3.

25. Diaz-perales A, Lombardero M, Sanchez-Monge R *et al*. Lipid-transfer proteins as potential plant panallergens: cross-reactivity among proteins of Artemisia pollen, Castanea nut and Rosaceae fruits, with different IgE-binding capacities. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2000;**30**:1403-10.

26. Pastorello EA, Pravettoni V, Farioli L *et al*. Hypersensitivity to mugwort (*Artemisia vulgaris*) in patients with peach allergy is due to a common lipid transfer protein allergen and is often without clinical expression. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2002;**110**:310-7.

27. Lombardero M, Garcia-Selles FJ, Polo F *et al*. Prevalence of sensitization to *Artemisia* allergens Art v 1, Art v 3 and Art v 60 kDa. Cross-reactivity among Art v 3 and other relevant lipid-transfer protein allergens. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2004;**34**:1415-21.

28. Yamamoto T, Asakura K, Kataura A. [Hypersensitivity to apple pulp among patients with birch pollinosis in Hokkaido]. *Arerugi* 1993;**42**:1701-6 (in Japanese).

29. Nakahara T, Ashida T, Etoh Y, Yoshikawa T, Ide T, Tabata S. [A case of alder (Alnus sieboldiana) pollinosis and its prevalence among the residents of a densely forested area]. *Arerugi* 1990;**39**:104-9 (in Japanese).

30. Arai Y, Ogawa C, Ohtomo M, Sano Y, Ito K. [Food and food additives hypersensitivity in adult asthmatics. II. Oral allergy syndrome in adult asthmatic with or without Japanese cedar hay fever]. *Arerugi* 1998;**47**:715-9 (in Japanese).

31. Namba H, Sahashi N, Yamamoto M *et al*. [Investigation of patients suffering from Japanese cedar pollinosis conducted through a questionnaire]. *[Jpn J Palynol]* 2004;**50**: 73-82 (in Japanese).

32. Kondo Y, Urisu A, Tokuda R. Identification and characterization of allergens of tomato fruit by immunoblotting. *Int Arch Allergy immunol* 2001;**126**:294-9.

33. Kondo Y, Tokuda R, Urisu A, Matsuda T. Assessment of cross-reactivity between Japanese cedar (Cryptomeria japonica) pollen and tomato fruit extracts by RAST inhibition and immunoblot inhibition. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2002;**32**: 590-4.

34. Fujimura M, Ohmori K, Masuda K, Tsujimoto H, Sakaguchi M. Oral allergy syndrome induced by tomato in a dog with Japanese cedar (Cryptomeria japonica) pollinosis. *J Vet Med Sci* 2002;**64**:1069-70.

35. Asero R. Effects of birch pollen-specific immunotherapy

on apple allergy in birch pollen-hypersensitive patients. *Clin Exp Allergy* 1998;**28**:1368-73.

36. Kelso JM, Jones RT, Tellez R *et al*. Oral allergy syndrome successfully treated with pollen immunotherapy. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 1995;**74**:391-6.

37. Asero R. How long does the effect of birch pollen injection SIT on apple allergy last? *Allergy* 2003;**58**:435-8.

38. Bindslev-Jansen C, Vibits A, Stahl Skov P, Weeke B. Oral Allergy syndrome: the effect of astemizole. *Allergy* 1991; **46**:610-3.

39. Bohle B, Zwolfer B, Heratizadeh A *et al*. Cooking birch pollen-related food: Divergent consequences for IgE-and T cell-mediated reactivity *in vitro* and *in vivo*. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2006;**118**:242-9.

- 105 -

ORIGINAL ARTICLE ▬▬

Comparison of Allergenic Properties of Salmon (*Oncorhynchus nerka*) between Landlocked and Anadromous Species

Yasuto Kondo[1], Jeakun Ahn[1], Ryo Komatsubara[1], Akihiko Terada[2], Toshitaka Yasuda[3], Ikuya Tsuge[1] and Atsuo Urisu[1]

ABSTRACT

Background: Salmon is one of the most widely consumed seafoods in Japan and many other countries around the world. Due to the confirmed cases of salmon-induced allergy, the food sanitation law in Japan stipulates salmon as one of the specific food items for which labeling is recommended when used as an ingredient of processed foods. However, trout, the landlocked form of anadromous salmon, is not subject to the allergen-labeling requirements, even though both populations belong to a single species. Since no supporting data have been demonstrated to make a clear distinction between these two populations in terms of allergenicity, we comparatively examined their allergenic properties using sera from patients allergic to fish.

Methods: Extracts of *Oncorhynchus nerka* from different habitats were obtained: kokanee (landlocked) and red salmon (anadromous). Control extracts were derived from four other species. This study focused on the (1) IgE-binding capacity of the fish extracts in patients' sera ($n = 50$), (2) ELISA inhibition test ($n = 6$), and (3) inhibition immunoblot test ($n = 8$) between the kokanee and red salmon.

Results: The extracts from kokanee and red salmon showed the highest correlation with each other in terms of the IgE-binding capacity, and showed complete (100%) reciprocal cross-inhibition in the ELISA inhibition test. On immunoblotting, there was no marked difference in the staining pattern between the two extracts, and each IgE-binding band gradually disappeared when the patients' sera were preincubated with the counterpart antigen in a dose-dependent manner.

Conclusions: These results suggest that kokanee has similar allergenic properties to red salmon.

INTRODUCTION

Most salmon are born in rivers, migrate to the sea, and return to the same rivers for spawning after spending several years at sea. However, some salmon do not migrate to the sea, but remain in the rivers. The former are called anadromous and the latter landlocked. As well-known examples, kokanee are landlocked and red salmon are anadromous in *Oncorhynchus nerka*, and rainbow trout are landlocked and steelhead are anadromous in *Oncorhynchus myk-* *iss*. Thus, salmon and trout belong to a single species.

Salmon and trout are consumed worldwide, and are reportedly a cause of allergy.[1-5] In Japan, 24 and 8 cases of salmon-induced immediate food allergy were reported in 2001–2002 and 2005, respectively.[6] Currently, the Japanese Allergic Food Sanitation Law includes salmon in specified food ingredients, and the labeling of foods containing salmon is recommended. In contrast, labeling is not obligatory for trout, despite salmon and trout belonging to the same species living in different habitats.

[1]Department of Pediatrics, Fujita Health University, [2]Department of Pediatrics, Daido Hospital, Aichi and [3]Toyo Suisan Kaisha, Ltd, Tokyo, Japan.
Correspondence: Yasuto Kondo, Department of Pediatrics, Fujita Health University, 1-98 Dengakugakubo, Kutukake, Toyoake, Aichi 470–1192, Japan.
Email: ykondo@fujita-hu.ac.jp

- 106 -

Table 1 Profile of 6 patients with allergic reactions to salmon and 2 patients with a high salmon-specific IgE level

Patient No.	Age (year)	Sex	Salmon-induced symptoms	Specific IgE (UA/ml, score)	
1	1	Male	Urticaria	2.25	2
2	1	Female	Urticaria	2.20	2
3	2	Male	Exanthema, itching	5.55	3
4	4	Female	Abdominal pain, vomit	75.5	5
5	5	Male	Abdominal pain, diarrhea	> 100	6
6	9	Female	Urticaria	6.17	3
7	1	Male	Avoidance	37.7	4
8	6	Male	Avoidance	24.4	4

Table 2 Correlation coefficient of IgE-binding rate (n = 50)

	Red salmon	Kokanee	Silver salmon	Rainbow trout	Jack mackerel
Kokanee	0.885				
Silver salmon	0.851	0.882			
Rainbow trout	0.706	0.746	0.849		
Jack mackerel	0.723	0.824	0.700	0.685	
Bluefin tuna	0.182	0.281	0.198	0.101	0.332

There has been no report on the allergenicity of the two habitat types, and so there is no evidence to distinguish their allergenicity. We investigated the difference in allergenicity between the two habitat types based on binding with patients' IgE.

METHODS

Antigen extractions: Fish antigens were extracted from raw fish meat using 1 M KCl buffer, as previously reported.[7] Antigens were extracted from land-locked *Oncorhynchus nerka*, kokanee, and its anadromous type, red salmon, belonging to *Salmoniformes, Salmonidae, Oncorhynchus*. For controls, different species of the same genus, rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and silver salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*), and species of a different order (*Perciformes*), Japanese jack mackerel (*Trachrus japonicus*) and bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*), popular foods in Japan, were selected.

ENZYME-LINKED IMMUNOSORBENT ASSAY (ELISA)

Each fish antigen-specific IgE was measured in sera of patients allergic to fish (n = 50), as follows:

The freeze-dried samples were dissolved (0.1 mg/ml) with PBS buffer and placed (0.1 ml/well) in each well of Nunc-Immuno Plate I (Nunc A/S, Roskilde, Denmark) for 1.5 hours at room temperature. Samples were discarded and SuperBlock Blocking Buffer in PBS (0.15 ml/well, Pierce, Rockford, IL, USA) was added and stored overnight at 4°C. Each well was washed with 0.2 ml/well of PBS-Tween and 0.1 ml/well of the serum diluted by SuperBlock Blocking Buffer (1 : 5) was added and stored overnight at room temperature. After being washed with PBS-Tween, Goat Anti-Human IgE BIOT (1 : 1,000, 0.1 ml/well, Vector Laboratories, Inc., Burlingame, CA, USA) was added for 1 hour at room temperature. This was washed well, and then streptavidin-HRP (1 : 5,000, 0.1 ml/well, Southern Biotechnology Associates, Bir-

mingham, AL, USA) was added for 1 hour at room temperature. This was washed well, followed by incubation with 0.1 ml/well of TMB (ICN Biomedicals, Aurora, OH, USA) for 30 minutes under a light shield. The reaction was stopped by adding 0.1 ml/well of 1 N HCl, and measured with LSPLATE manager 2001 (Wako, Osaka, Japan).

Using patients allergic to non-fish substances as controls (n = 30), the measured ELISA values of IgE antibodies against the fish antigens were compared with the mean control ELISA values. The values were divided by the SD of the control, and presented as Z scores. The IgE Z score against each fish meat was calculated using the equation below:

Z score against fish meat = (measured value of patients allergic to fish−mean measured value for control)/SD of the measured values of the control

The IgE antibody titers against the fish species were compared with regard to the Z score.

ELISA INHIBITION

Before addition to an ELISA plate precoated with extracts of red salmon or kokanee, serum samples were pre-incubated with solutions containing extracts (red salmon, kokanee, silver salmon, rainbow trout, Japanese jack mackerel, and bluefin tuna) at 4 different concentrations (0, 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, and 1.0 mg/ml) as inhibitors at room temperature. The subsequent procedure was the same as that for ELISA described above. To compare the rates of inhibition of IgE binding to the red salmon and kokanee antigens on the addition of each fish antigen, sera of 6 patients with salmon allergy (patients 1–6 in Table 1) were pooled and used.

TRANSFER AND IMMUNOBLOTTING

Sodium dodecylsulfate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS-PAGE) was performed using a 4–20% Trisglycine precast gel (Tefco Corporation, Machida, Japan) according to the Laemmli method under reducing conditions. Each sample was separated at 120 V for 2 hours. After electrophoresis, proteins were transferred to Immobilon-P membranes (Millipore, Bedford, MA, USA), as previously reported.[8] For the detection of IgE bound to the protein bands, the blot was reacted with biotin-labeled anti-human IgE antibody used in ELISA (1 : 1,000) for 3 hours, washed,

Fig. 1 Correlation of IgE binding to red salmon and kokanee antigens with that to other fish species antigens (n = 50). The IgE binding capacity of sera of 50 patients allergic to fish with each fish antigen was presented as the Z score and compared.

and reacted with streptoavidin-HRP (1 : 5,000) for 1 hour. After being washed, the blot was subjected to color development using the ECL™ Western Blotting Analysis System (GE Healthcare UK, Little Chalfont, UK).

Sera of the 6 patients allergic to salmon and 2 fish-allergic patients avoiding salmon ingestion because of a high salmon-specific IgE level, 8 sera in total (patients 1–8 in Table 1), were investigated. For the control, sera from patients allergic to non-fish substances were used.

IMMUNOBLOT INHIBITION

After each protein was transferred to the Immobilon-P membrane, pooled sera showing a high IgE antibody titer to multiple fish antigens preincubated with each extracted solution (0, 1, and 100 ug) as inhibitors were added. The detection of bound IgE was the same as described above.

The pooled serum of the 8 patients applied to immunoblotting was investigated.

RESULTS

COMPARISON OF RATES OF IgE BINDING TO THE FISH ANTIGENS (FIG. 1, TABLE 2)

On comparison of IgE binding shown in Table 2, the correlation between red salmon and kokanee, belonging to the same species, was the highest (r = 0.885), and that between red salmon and bluefin tuna, belonging to different orders, was the lowest (r = 0.182). As shown in Figure 1, the line representing the corre-

lation between red salmon and kokanee was slightly sloped toward the red salmon side.

### COMPETITION FOR IgE (FIG. 2)

In the ELISA inhibition test, the rates of IgE-binding inhibition caused by different species in the same genus, silver salmon and rainbow trout, were about 50%, and those by species belonging to a different order, Japanese jack mackerel and bluefin tuna, were 83 and 70%, respectively. In contrast, between red salmon and kokanee, IgE binding was 100% inhibited by the counterpart antigen.

IMMUNOBLOT AND IMMUNOBLOT INHIBITION (FIG. 3, 4)

On immunoblotting, there was no marked difference in the staining pattern between the two antigens; however, a 94-kDa band was only stained in kokanee in 4 patients (patients 4, 5, 7, and 8 in Fig. 3). Staining of 13-kDa bands of red salmon and kokanee was positive in all sera excluding the control serum. This protein band was confirmed as parvalbumin using the mouse monoclonal antiparvalbumin antibody clone PARV-19 (1 : 3,000; Sigma-Aldrich, St Louis, MO, USA, data not shown). Staining of 44-54-kDa protein bands of the two habitat types was equivalent in 5 patients (patients 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8). All IgE binding to 13- and 44-54-kDa proteins of red salmon and kokanee and the 94-kDa protein of kokanee was inhibited by the addition of the antigen of the other species in a concentration-dependent manner (Fig. 4). Twenty-

Fig. 2 ELISA inhibition with red salmon and kokanee antigens. Sera of 6 patients allergic to salmon were pooled and used. The rate of inhibition by other fish species antigens were 48-83%, but red salmon and kokanee antigens inhibited IgE binding to the counterpart by 100%.


Fig. 3 Immunoblotting of red salmon and kokanee antigens. IgE of most patients' sera bound to the 13-kDa band common in red salmon and kokanee. Lanes 1-6: sera of 6 patients allergic to salmon, lanes 7 and 8: sera of 2 patients with a high CAP level, c: serum of patients allergic to non-fish substances. *: Specific binding, •: nonspecific binding.

Fig. 4 Immunoblot inhibition between red salmon and kokanee. The pooled serum used in Fig.3 was subjected to the inhibition test between red salmon and kokanee. The specific IgE binding to 13- and 44-54-kDa proteins common in red salmon and kokanee and 94-kDa protein in kokanee was inhibited by the addition of the counterpart antigen at a low level. *: Specific binding, • : nonspecific binding.

five- and 75-kDa protein bands were reacted with the control serum, and the binding was not inhibited by the addition of the identical antigen, suggesting that the binding was nonspecific.

DISCUSSION

The Allergen Food Sanitation Law includes salmon in specified food ingredients, and the labeling of foods containing salmon is recommended. However, such labeling is not obligatory for trout, despite salmon and trout belonging to the same species living in different habitats, which may have been due to the numbers of reported cases, and not based on allergenicity. In our previous study on 38 patients with fish al-

lergy, 12 were allergic to salmon, but only one, a 4-year-old infant allergic to salmon, was allergic to trout.[9] We in Japan have very few occasions to eat trout compared to salmon, which may be a reason for the small number of reported cases of trout allergy. However, if their allergenicity is identical, those allergic to salmon may develop allergy when they eat non-labeled foods containing trout, which should be prevented. Thus, we investigated the difference in antigenicity between salmon and trout using sera of patients with salmon allergy.

Using sera of patients allergic to fish, the correla-

tion of IgE binding to red salmon and kokanee with those to other fish species was investigated. The correlation was highest between the same species, and 100% inhibition was achieved on the ELISA inhibition test, suggesting that the antigenicity of red salmon and kokanee was almost the same. A high-level correlation of IgE binding with a different species, Japanese jack mackerel, was also noted, but the ELISA inhibition rate did not reach 100% even at the highest salmon antigen concentration, suggesting the presence of a specific allergen shared by red salmon, kokanee, and Japanese jack mackerel, other than the major antigens. No correlation with bluefin tuna was noted in IgE binding, suggesting that tuna show little common antigenicity, but the inhibition reached nearly 70% with an increase in the concentration, indicating that protein with a common antigenicity is present in tuna, although the content is low.

On immunoblotting, a strongly stained 94-kDa protein was detected in kokanee, and this may have emerged due to differences in the habitat, but IgE binding to kokanee was inhibited by red salmon from a low concentration on the ELISA inhibition test, and, consistently, IgE binding to the 94-kDa protein was inhibited by red salmon at a low concentration on immunoblot inhibition. Based on these findings, it is unlikely that the variation in the expression level of this protein leads to a difference in allergenicity between the habitat types.

The allergenicity of red salmon and kokanee may be equivalent, and the labeling of foods containing trout is also recommended.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

1. Aas K. Studies of hypersensitivity to fish: allergological and serological differentiation between various species of fish. *Int Arch Allergy Appl Immunol* 1996;**30**:257-67.
2. Kalogeromitros D, Makris M, Gregoriou S *et al.* IgE-mediated sensitization in seafood processing workers. *Allergy Asthma Proc* 2006;**27**:399-403.
3. Van Do T, Elsayed S, Florvaag E, Hordvik I, Endresen C. Allergy to fish parvalbumins: Studies on the cross-reactivity of allergens from 9 commonly consumed fish. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2005;**116**:1314-20.
4. Van Do T, Hordvik I, Endresen C, Elsayed S. Expression and analysis of recombinant salmon parvalbumin, the major allergen in Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar). *Scand J Immunol* 1999;**50**:619-25.
5. Bernhisel-Broadbent J, Strause D, Sampson HA. Fish hypersensitivity. II: Clinical relevance of altered fish allergenicity caused by various preparation methods. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1992;**90**:622-9.
6. Ebisawa M, Imai K. [Food sanitation law: labeling of foods containing allergic substances, a proposal for specified ingredients (from the 2005 nationwide monitoring)]. In: Urisu A (ed). *[Report on Study for Development of Test Method of Allergic Substances Contained in Foods]*. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare of Japan, 2005;89-92 (in Japanese).
7. Kondo Y, Kakami M, Koyama H *et al.* IgE cross-reactivity between fish roes (salmon, herring and pollock) and chicken egg in the patients who have anaphylaxis to salmon roe. *Allergol Int* 2005;**54**:317-23.
8. Hsieh L-S, Moos M, Lin Y. Characterization of apple 18 and 31 kd allergens by microsequencing and evaluation of their concentration during storage and ripening. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1995;**96**:960-70.
9. Koyama H, Kakami M, Kawamura M *et al.* Grades of 43 fish species in Japan based on IgE-binding activity. *Allergol Int* 2006;**55**:311-6.

REVIEW ARTICLE ▬▬▬

Diagnosis of Food Allergy Based on Oral Food Challenge Test

Komei Ito[1] and Atsuo Urisu[2]

ABSTRACT
Diagnosis of food allergy should be based on the observation of allergic symptoms after intake of the suspected food. The oral food challenge test (OFC) is the most reliable clinical procedure for diagnosing food allergy. The OFC is also applied for the diagnosis of tolerance of food allergy. The Japanese Society of Pediatric Allergy and Clinical Immunology issued the 'Japanese Pediatric Guideline for Oral Food Challenge Test in Food Allergy 2009' in April 2009, to provide information on a safe and standardized method for administering the OFC. This review focuses on the clinical applications and procedure for the OFC, based on the Japanese OFC guideline.

KEY WORDS
food hypersensitivity, guideline, immunoglobulin E, oral food challenge, tolerance

ABBREVIATIONS
OFC, oral food challenge test; IgE, immunoglobulin E; Japanese OFC Guideline, Japanese Pediatric Guideline for Oral Food Challenge Test in Food Allergy 2009; DBPCFC, double-blind placebo-controlled food challenge; GI, gastrointestinal; SPT, skin prick test; HRT, basophil histamine-releasing test; FPIES, food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome.

INTRODUCTION

Food allergies affect 12.8% of infants, 5.1% of 3-year-olds[1] and 1.3-2.6% of school-age children in Japan. These allergies are associated with numerous social problems in nurseries, kindergartens and schools, particularly in terms of providing lunches to the affected children,[2] and in preparing for unexpected severe reactions after accidental ingestion of allergic foods.[3]

In 2008, the Japanese Society of School Health issued a guideline for the management of allergic diseases in schools (http://www.hokenkai.or.jp/). This guideline emphasized the importance of proper medical diagnosis for appropriate management of allergic students, especially with food allergy.

Definitions and diagnosis of food allergy should be based on the presence of clinical manifestations after ingestion of the offending food.[4] Proof of an immunological mechanism, typically as the detection of allergen-specific immunogloblin (Ig)E antibodies,

should be associated with the diagnosis, but proof of sensitization itself without provocation is not diagnostic of food allergy.[5]

Clinical testing to detect allergen-specific IgE antibodies (ImmunoCAP FEIA®, Phadia KK., Tokyo) is widely used in Japanese pediatric practice, particularly for patients with infantile atopic dermatitis, to determine the allergic background of the eczema. Examinations have sometimes been performed before the introduction of solid foods to babies, not only for the management of eczema,[6] but also to avoid unexpected anaphylactic reactions at the first intake of foods to which the baby might already have been sensitized through breast milk.[7] Transient elimination of sensitized foods may help to control the allergic conditions of infants, but proper diagnosis of food allergy should follow.[8]

Diagnosis of food allergy should be based on a convincing history of allergic reactions or on the result of an oral food challenge test (OFC).[9] The OFC has been covered by public medical insurance in Japan

[1]Department of Allergy, Aichi Children's Health and Medical Center and [2]Department of Pediatrics, The Second Teaching Hospital of Fujita Health University, Aichi, Japan.
Correspondence: Komei Ito, Department of Allergy, Aichi Children's Health and Medical Center, 1–2 Osakada, Morioka, Obu-
city, Aichi 474–8710, Japan.
Email: koumei_itoh@mx.achmc.pref.aichi.jp

since 2006, but too few institutions can provide the OFC to meet the needs of patients, and a standardized protocol for the OFC has been absent.[10]

The Japanese Society of Pediatric Allergy and Clinical Immunology issued the 'Japanese Pediatric Guideline for Oral Food Challenge Test in Food Allergy 2009' (Japanese OFC Guideline, available only in Japanese) in April 2009, providing for the first time information about a safe and standardized method for administering the OFC.[11] This review focuses on the role of and practical methods for the OFC in the diagnosis and management of food allergy, based on the Japanese OFC Guideline.

CHARACTERISTICS AND CROSS-REACTIVITIES OF FOOD ALLERGENS THAT AFFECT THE OCCURRENCE OF FOOD ALLERGY

Hen's eggs, cow's milk and wheat are the three major food allergens accounting for 70% of patients who required treatment for acute reactions in 2008 in Japan. Peanut, salmon roe, shrimp and buckwheat are the next most common food allergens.[12]

Reactivity of food allergens or allergenic components of the foods can be highly modified by cooking methods. Hen's egg allergens, particularly ovalbumin, are sensitive to denaturing by heating, resulting in loss of IgE-binding capacity. Ovomucoid, on the other hand, is relatively resistant to heating[13] and protease digestion.[14] As a result, some patients with egg allergy can tolerate extensively heated egg products, and IgE antibody to ovomucoid can offer a good diagnostic marker to predict whether a child can eat heat-treated eggs.[15]

Caseins constitute 76-86% of whole milk proteins, and among these, $\alpha s1$-casein is the major milk allergen.[16] This protein does not contain disulfide bonds and shows no tertiary structure. This characteristic structure explains why most IgE-binding epitopes are sequential (linear) and not susceptible to heat denaturation.[17] Conversely, another milk allergen, β-lactoglobulin, is highly conformational, and extensive heating may decrease the reactivity of milk for some patients.[18]

Wheat allergens can be divided into two fractions: a water-salt soluble fraction (albumins and globulins); and gluten (gliadin and glutenin). Wheat and other cereal grains share a number of homologous proteins, mostly in the water-salt soluble fraction,[19] whereas gluten is a component exclusive to wheat. The fact that most patients with wheat allergy can consume other cereals, such as rice or corn, suggests that the dominant wheat allergens and IgE epitopes exist in components that are not cross-reactive with other cereals. Specific IgE testing for recombinant ω-5 gliadin can offer a good marker of immediate-type wheat allergy or anaphylaxis in children,[20] as well as wheat-dependent exercise-induced anaphylaxis in

adults.[21]

Allergen components of peanut have been extensively characterized, and recombinant allergens are ready for use in research.[22] However, no single recombinant allergen is satisfactory for the diagnosis of peanut allergy in terms of sensitivity and specificity.[23] Cross-reactivity to homologous proteins in soybeans, Gly m 5 (vs. Ara h 1) and Gly m 6 (vs. Ara h 3),[24] and other tree nut allergens[25,26] requires more extensive study, particularly in terms of the relationship with clinical manifestations.

Taken together, knowledge of food allergens is required to interpret the results of allergen-specific IgE testing,[27] but no single in vitro test represents an alternative to a convincing history of allergic symptoms or the OFC.

ORAL FOOD CHALLENGE TEST

DEFINITION OF THE OFC

The general methodology for the OFC is to administer the suspected food in gradually increasing doses under a medical setting.[28] A single trial with intake of a small amount of the suspected food at home or in the office may help in the introduction of eliminated foods, but is not defined as an OFC, because it is not diagnostic of food allergy.

An open challenge refers to an OFC in which the patient can recognize the target food without blinding. The results can be definitive if the challenge yields either negative results or positive results with objective symptoms. This approach may be appropriate for most infants or young children, because psychological claims of symptoms are negligible at those ages. However, if the patient complains only of subjective symptoms such as abdominal pain or pruritus, particularly when the patient displays anxiety about the challenge, interpreting challenge result is difficult.

A single-blind challenge means that the patient does not know whether the food contains the suspected allergen, but the observer knows.[29] A masking effect sometimes helps to reduce psychological effects or difficulty eating in small children, but a single-blind challenge without placebo is essentially similar to an open challenge.

A double-blind placebo-controlled food challenge (DBPCFC), in which both the patient and observer are blinded to the challenge material, remains the gold standard for diagnosing food allergy for both clinical and scientific purposes.[30] A provocation kit containing dried powder[31] of each food (whole egg, cow's milk, wheat and soybean) and a masking material (strawberry puree) is provided through the Food Provocation Network in Japan by the National Food Allergy Research Group (Fig. 1).

AIMS AND INDICATIONS

The OFC is generally carried out for two purposes:

Single blind/Double blind

[Medical check by doctor]
  Physical checkup
  Consulting patient's parents
  (regarding blood-test results and their
  demand)
  After explanation, obtain signed informed
  consent.
[Food provocation kit]
  Dried food powder + strawberry puree
[Schedule]

Food provocation										
Time (min)	Start	15	30	45	60	90	2 h	3 h	4 h	6 h	24 h

Evaluation ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
dose   1/20 1/10 1/5 3/10 Rest

[When doctor confirms symptom]
  Stop the challenge and treat the symptom.

Fig. 1 Provocation kit and the protocol for blind food challenge.

diagnosis of food allergy; or determination of tolerance to the allergic food.

Diagnostic OFC is typically used in three situations. First, if a patient is suffering from chronic allergic conditions such as atopic dermatitis or persistent gastrointestinal (GI) symptoms, and elimination of the suspected food ameliorates the symptoms, an OFC to confirm the recurrence of symptoms is considered to establish an accurate diagnosis. Second, if a patient is suffering from acute allergic symptoms after eating multiple foods, and a precise history and/or in vitro diagnostic testing indicates some suspected foods, definitive diagnosis of the offending food may be achieved using the OFC. Third, and most frequently, is with the introduction of a sensitized food as confirmed by the presence of specific IgE antibody or positive results from a skin prick test (SPT), for the first time in life. This scenario is mostly the case in infants with atopic dermatitis, but patients and their family with known food allergy tend to avoid highly allergenic foods such as peanuts, buckwheat and shrimp, particularly if they have ever shown positive specific IgE titers. Careful setting of the OFC may be needed in this case, because introduction of a highly sensitized food for the first time in life can sometimes induce severe reactions.

Diagnosis of the achievement of tolerance (outgrowing the allergy) is another important indication for the OFC. Most infants with egg,[32] milk,[33] wheat[34] or soybean allergies tend to outgrow these allergies during childhood. Information on symptoms following accidental exposure helps determine an indication for the OFC. If the patient has experienced a severe reaction recently within 1 year, the OFC is not indicated. Patients with strict avoidance of the allergic food for more than 1 year may be considered for an OFC. Information about daily consumption of

foods containing small amounts of the suspected component is also helpful to determine indications and procedures for the OFC.

Allergies to peanut,[35] tree nuts,[36] buckwheat or shrimp, especially in older children or adults, are thought to continue throughout life. An OFC to those foods may not be indicated unless loss of sensitization is confirmed by negative results from an SPT or specific IgE test.

DECIDING ON THE CHALLENGE PROTOCOL

Selection of a challenge protocol should be based on the safety and accuracy of the OFC.[37] The total provocation dose may be large enough compared to daily consumption of the suspected food for the proper diagnosis of food allergy, but is sometimes considered too high for a highly sensitized patient with a history of severe reaction, in terms of safety. Using step-wise procedures in the OFC may be an option, with challenge using a small amount preceding a full-dose challenge.

The challenged food should be standardized for diagnosis of the food allergy. However, processed food may be an option for patients with known food allergy. Introduction of extensively heated foods,[38] partially digested foods or fermented food such as "miso", "shoyu" or "natto", which are traditional Japanese soy products,[39] may be tolerated and even effective for the induction of tolerance in some patients. Although allergenic activities of these foods are generally decreased, OFC should be considered before introduction, because some patients experience severe reactions to these foods.

Precise information on the history of the patient, which has already been mentioned, and immunological laboratory data are essential for deciding on the indications and procedure for OFC.

1) Sampson[41]

Specific IgE	Egg white	Milk	Peanut	Fish
Diagnostic decision points	7	15	14	20

(U_A/ml)

2) Komata[39]

Age (years)	<1	1	2≤
Egg white	13.0	23.0	30.0
Milk	5.8	38.6	57.3

3) Ando[14]

Food	Raw egg white		Heated egg white	
Specific IgE	Egg white	Ovomucoid	Egg white	Ovomucoid
Positive decision points	7.38	5.21	30.7	10.8

Fig. 2 Positive decision points for allergen-specific IgE titers to diagnose food allergy without food challenge.

Positive decision points for specific IgE antibodies, which indicate IgE titers with over 95% probability for positive challenge, have been proposed for some allergens (Fig. 2).[40] Patients with specific IgE titers above this point may be advised to continue a restricted diet without undergoing an OFC.[41] Probability curves for specific IgE titers are also helpful to predict the probability of positive challenge.[42] Even so, OFC might be performed for highly sensitized patients to identify the threshold amount of suspected food inducing allergic symptoms, and to provide the patient with advice on safe levels of the food. Emphasis is required on the fact that specific IgE titers do not always correlate to threshold amounts of food or the severity of allergic symptoms.

SPT also indicates sensitization to the suspected food,[43,44] sometimes in patients with negative results for specific IgE in serum. Results from an SPT help to predict a positive challenge in patients with negative or low specific IgE titers to milk or egg,[45] but false positive results are also common.

The basophil histamine-releasing test (HRT) is also commercially available in Japan.[46] High scores (Class 4) in HRT for egg white, milk and wheat suggest more than 90% probability for positive challenge, particularly in patients who have experienced anaphylaxis.[47] Decreased HRT titers in patients maintaining high specific IgE titers sometimes indicate the achievement of tolerance to the food.

SETTING AND PROCEDURES

All institutes at which OFCs are performed have to be fully equipped for access to emergency treatment. The site may be in-hospital, but an outpatient office or clinic may also be suitable for some patients in whom severe reactions are not predicted. A safe, clean and comfortable environment, hopefully free from contact with other patients with infectious diseases, needs to be provided for patients to spend a long period. Well-

trained doctors or nurses should keep in touch with the patient throughout the procedure, and the contribution of a dietitian helps a great deal.[48]

The risks and benefits of OFC should be discussed with the patient and parents, and written informed consent needs to be obtained in most cases.

Before proceeding with the OFC, the patient needs to be stable in terms of allergic symptoms and free from any acute illness. Antihistamines should have been discontinued for >72 h and any other medications for the treatment or prevention of allergic diseases discontinued for an appropriate period based on the duration of action, except inhaled corticosteroids and topical corticosteroid ointments applied on small areas of skin lesions.

Typical challenge foods and total doses administered are listed in Table 1. The starting dose should be 1 g (1 ml) or less of the food.[49] The typical challenge scheme is to divide the total dose into 3-6 incremental doubling doses, such as 1, 2, 4, 8 and 16 g of boiled egg white or 1, 5, 10, 25, 50 and 100 ml of milk. A challenge with smaller doses should be considered for patients deemed to be at risk of severe reaction, such as 0.1 ml for the starting dose of milk.[50]

When processed food is used for a blind challenge, equivalent doses of allergen content should be considered and a standardized cooking method may be applied to minimize the variation of allergen activity.

Doses are generally given every 15-30 min over 1-2 h. A longer dosing interval might be applied for severe patients or for those who have experienced a late-onset allergic reaction after intake of the suspected food. If a sign of suspicious reaction appears, the next dose should be postponed to observe the progress of symptoms, or the same dose should be repeated to avoid overloading.

The patient may stay in hospital for more than 2 h after the final dose is given or the provoked symptoms disappear. Upon discharge, the patient needs to be instructed to observe the possibility of late-onset symptoms, even after a negative (passed) challenge.

SYMPTOMS AND TREATMENTS

The expected reactions during OFC involve cutaneous, mucosal, respiratory, GI, cardiovascular and neurological symptoms (Table 2). Parallel to the allergic reactions observed with accidental intake, cutaneous symptoms are most frequently observed in 80% of positive (failed) challenges, followed by respiratory (35%) and GI (25%) symptoms.[51]

Respiratory symptoms are common and need to be treated properly. Coughing might be divided into two categories: dry and staccato coughing estimated to be of laryngeal origin; and productive coughing associated with wheezing or asthma.[52]

Oral symptoms are frequently reported at the beginning of challenge, but sometimes disappear afterward. Distinguishing whether such symptoms are a

470

- 114 -

Table 1 Recommended protocol for open food challenge

Target foods	Challenge foods	Step[†]	Initial dose	Total dose	Scheme
Egg	Boiled egg yolk	1	1 g	15 g (1 egg yolk)	1-2-4-8 g
	Boiled egg white	2[‡]	0.1 g	2-4 g	0.1-0.2-0.5-1-2 g
		3	1 g	16-32 g (1 egg)	1-2-4-8-16 g
Milk	Raw milk	1	0.05-0.1 ml	15-30 ml	0.1-1-2-4-8-15 ml
		2	1-5 ml	100-200 ml	1-5-10-25-50-100 ml
Wheat	Udon noodle (boiled)	1	0.5 g	15-30 g	0.5-1-2-4-8-15 g
		2	1 g	50-100 g	1-2-5-15-25-50 g
Fish	Boiled or baked fish		1 g	30-60 g	1-2-4-8-15-30 g
Soy	Tofu (soy paste)		1 g	50-100 g	1-2-5-15-25-50 g

[†] A stepwise challenge protocol may be considered for high-risk patients.

[‡] Processed foods (cookies, cakes, etc.) are also available.

Table 2 Signs and symptoms observed in OFC

Cutaneous
  Pruritus, erythema, urticaria, angioedema
Oral
  Throat pain, itching of palate, tongue or lips, palatal redness or hives
Mucosal
  Eye swelling, tears, conjunctivitis
Upper respiratory
  Rhinorrhea, sneezing, and nasal obstruction
Lower respiratory
  Coughing, wheeze, dyspnea, stridor, hoarseness, chest tightness
Gastrointestinal
  Nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, abdominal pain or cramp
Cardiovascular
  Hypotension, light-headedness, cold extremities, cyanosis, syncope, collapse
Neurological
  Behavioral change, loss of activity, restlessness, dizziness, sleep

part of systemic reactions or an oral allergy syndrome induced by local absorption of water-soluble allergens is difficult, but may be important.

Neurological symptoms might be a sign of systemic reactions, particularly when a small child is violently frightened and crying, or suddenly turns quiet.[53] Overwhelming tiredness and sleepiness are sometimes observed in older children associated with GI symptoms, but without cardiovascular symptoms like hypotension or decreased oxygen saturations.

Grading symptoms is helpful for deciding on treatment strategies (Table 3). Treatment may not be necessary for localized skin or mild mucosal symptoms (Grade 1). Most skin and mucosal symptoms may be treated using antihistamines (oral or parenteral). Beta-agonist inhalation may be applied to mild respiratory symptoms, and oxygen should be administered if oxygen saturation falls below 95% (Grade 2,

Step 1 treatment, Fig. 3).

When symptoms reach Grade 3, Step 2 treatment should be applied. Intramuscular adrenaline (0.01 mg/kg) is the first-line treatment in Step 2. Effects of adrenaline may be observed within 5 min, when most skin, respiratory, GI and even neurological signs tend to disappear. If the effect was insufficient or symptoms reappear after 10-15 min, repeat administration of intramuscular adrenaline may be considered, and additional treatments such as intravenous fluid, parenteral antihistamine or corticosteroids should be applied. Repeat inhalation of beta-agonists or adrenaline[54] may be an option for persistent but mild respiratory symptoms.

In cases of severe reactions accompanied by intractable hypotension or respiratory distress, full resuscitation with bolus rehydration (30 ml/kg normal saline), respiratory supports and catecholamine should be applied in the intensive care unit (Step 3).

DIET MANAGEMENT BASED ON RESULTS OF THE OFC

Based on the total dose and symptoms provoked in the OFC, patients should be instructed about restrictions or re-introduction of the challenge food. Even after a negative challenge, the amount of food intake at home may not exceed that of the total dose at least several times to confirm safety.

Positive challenge does not always suggest a need for complete elimination of the food from the diet.[55] Patients may introduce small amounts of the target food within the appropriate safety range, at 1-10% of the threshold level in general, or the processed food in which decreased allergic reactivity is expected.

Repeated follow-up visits are needed to confirm the benefits of the OFC, particularly when re-introduction of the eliminated food is in progress. In many cases, the patient and parents are anxious about the occurrence of allergic symptoms even after a negative challenge, or may actually experience some mild symptoms after eating the target food. Providing instructions to the patient's school about restrictions to the

Table 3 Grading of symptoms observed with oral food challenge

Grade	Skin	Gastrointestinal	Respiratory mucosal	Cardiovascular	Neurological
1	Faint rash Wheals (<3) Pruritus	Nausea Oral/pharyngeal discomfort, itch	—	—	—
2	Localized rash Wheals (3-10) Worsening of eczema Increased scratch	Vomiting/diarrhea (1-2) Transient colic	Sneeze Rhinorrhea/nasal obstruction Scratch nose/eyes Cough (<10)	—	Loss of activity
3	Systemic rash/wheals Severe itch Angioedema	Vomiting/diarrhea (≥3) Persistent colic	Cough (≥10) Wheeze Husky voice/Barking cough Difficulty swallowing	Increased heart rate (≥15 bpm) Pallor	Fatigue · sleep or irritability
4	As above	Vomiting/diarrhea with dehydration	Dyspnea Weak respiration Cyanosis	Arrhythmia Mild hypotension Cold extremities Sweat skin	Dizziness Distraction
5	As above	As above	Respiratory arrest	Severe bradycardia Severe hypotension Cardiac arrest	Loss of consciousness

Grading should be based on the most severe symptom.

Fig. 3 Treatment plan for allergic symptoms. †Consider oral corticosteroid to prevent late reactions.

lunch menu is an important social activity to improve quality of life and safety of the patient.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

The Japanese OFC Guideline principally deals with the diagnosis of immediate food hypersensitivity. Diagnostic food challenge for non-IgE-mediated allergic reactions including food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome (FPIES)[56] and late-onset worsening of eczema,[57] both of which are thought to be cell-mediated

472

immunological disorders, is not described in the guideline, because insufficient evidence is available to establish a standardized protocol at this time. Indirect food challenges such as provocation through breast milk after giving the target food to the lactating mother,[58] or labial food challenge[59] are also not dealt with.

The guideline does not recommend a single universal procedure, but places emphasis on users arranging their own protocol to meet the conditions of their institute and patient needs. In any case, safety remains the most important consideration, and the key safety point might be that OFC is conducted by experienced staff who are present throughout the procedure, continuously interacting with the patient.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

1. Ebisawa M, Sugizaki C. Prevalence of pediatric allergic diseases in the first 5 years of life. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2008;**121**:S237.
2. Imai T. [Provision against food allergy at the school lunch in Japan]. *Arerugi* 2005;**54**:1197-202 (in Japanese).
3. McIntyre CL, Sheetz AH, Carroll CR, Young MC. Administration of epinephrine for life-threatening allergic reactions in school settings. *Pediatrics* 2005;**116**:1134-40.
4. Berni Canani R, Ruotolo S, Discepolo V, Troncone R. The diagnosis of food allergy in children. *Curr Opin Pediatr* 2008;**20**:584-9.
5. Hill DJ, Hosking CS, Reyes-Benito LV. Reducing the need for food allergen challenges in young children: a comparison of in vitro with in vivo tests. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2001;**31**: 1031-5.
6. Ikematsu K, Tachimoto H, Sugisaki C, Syukuya A, Ebisawa M. [Feature of food allergy developed during infancy (1)—relationship between infantile atopic dermatitis and food allergy]. *Arerugi* 2006;**55**:140-50 (in Japanese).
7. Garcia C, El-Qutob D, Martorell A *et al*. Sensitization in early age to food allergens in children with atopic dermatitis. *Allergol Immunopathol (Madr)* 2007;**35**:15-20.
8. Ito K, Morishita M, Ito A, Sakamoto T, Torii S. [Immediate type food hypersensitivity associated with atopic dermatitis in children]. *Arerugi* 2004;**53**:24-33 (in Japanese).
9. Mukoyama T, Nishima S, Arita M *et al*. Guidelines for diagnosis and management of pediatric food allergy in Japan. *Allergol Int* 2007;**56**:349-61.
10. Futamura M, Ito K, Arita M, Urisu A. [The Current State of Oral Food Challenge Test by Pediatric Allergy Specialists]. *Jpn J Pediatr Allergy Clinical Immunol* 2009;**23**:279-86 (in Japanese).
11. Japanese Society of Pediatric Allergy and Clinical Immunology. *[Japanese Pediatric Guideline for Oral Food Challenge Test in Food Allergy 2009]*. Tokyo: Kyowa Kikaku, 2009 (in Japanese).
12. Imai T. [National surveillance of immediate type food allergy in Japan]. In: Imai T. *[Work report of a study for the development and prevention of food allergy]*. Tokyo:Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, 2009;5-9 (in Japanese).
13. Urisu A, Ando H, Morita Y *et al*. Allergenic activity of heated and ovomucoid-depleted egg white. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1997;**100**:171-6.
14. Takagi K, Teshima R, Okunuki H *et al*. Kinetic analysis of pepsin digestion of chicken egg white ovomucoid and allergenic potential of pepsin fragments. *Int Arch Allergy Immunol* 2005;**136**:23-32.
15. Ando H, Moverare R, Kondo Y *et al*. Utility of ovomucoid-specific IgE concentrations in predicting symptomatic egg allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2008;**122**:583-8.
16. Shek LP, Bardina L, Castro R, Sampson HA, Beyer K. Humoral and cellular responses to cow milk proteins in patients with milk-induced IgE-mediated and non-IgE-mediated disorders. *Allergy* 2005;**60**:912-9.
17. Chatchatee P, Jarvinen KM, Bardina L, Beyer K, Sampson HA. Identification of IgE- and IgG-binding epitopes on alpha (s1)-casein: differences in patients with persistent and transient cow's milk allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2001;**107**:379-83.
18. Jarvinen KM, Chatchatee P, Bardina L *et al*. IgE and IgG binding epitopes on alpha-lactalbumin and beta-lactoglobulin in cow's milk allergy. *Int Arch Allergy Immunol* 2001;**126**:111-8.
19. Urisu A, Yamada K, Masuda S *et al*. 16-kilodalton rice protein is one of the major allergens in rice grain extract and responsible for cross-allergenicity between cereal grains in the Poaceae family. *Int Arch Allergy Appl Immunol* 1991;**96**:244-52.
20. Ito K, Futamura M, Borres MP *et al*. IgE antibodies to omega-5 gliadin associate with immediate symptoms on oral wheat challenge in Japanese children. *Allergy* 2008; **63**:1536-42.
21. Morita E, Matsuo H, Morimoto K, Savage AW, Tatham AS. Fast omega-gliadin is a major allergen in wheat-dependent exercise-induced anaphylaxis. *J Dermatol Sci* 2003;**33**:99-104.
22. Burks AW, Cockrell G, Stanley JS, Helm RM, Bannon GA. Recombinant peanut allergen Ara h 1 expression and IgE binding in patients with peanut hypersensitivity. *J Clin Invest* 1995;**96**:1715-21.
23. Rabjohn P, Helm EM, Stanley JS *et al*. Molecular cloning and epitope analysis of the peanut allergen Ara h 3. *J Clin Invest* 1999;**103**:535-42.
24. Holzhauser T, Wackermann O, Ballmer-Weber BK *et al*. Soybean (Glycine max) allergy in Europe: Gly m 5 (beta-conglycinin) and Gly m 6 (glycinin) are potential diagnostic markers for severe allergic reactions to soy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2009;**123**:452-8.
25. Barre A, Sordet C, Culerrier R, Rance F, Didier A, Rouge P. Vicilin allergens of peanut and tree nuts (walnut, hazelnut and cashew nut) share structurally related IgE-binding epitopes. *Mol Immunol* 2008;**45**:1231-40.
26. Barre A, Jacquet G, Sordet C, Culerrier R, Rouge P. Homology modelling and conformational analysis of IgE-binding epitopes of Ara h 3 and other legumin allergens with a cupin fold from tree nuts. *Mol Immunol* 2007;**44**: 3243-55.
27. Ito K. [Practical diagnosis of food allergy]. *Arerugi* 2008; **57**:1109-16 (in Japanese).
28. Nowak-Wegrzyn A, Assa'ad AH, Bahna SL, Bock SA, Sicherer SH, Teuber SS, and Adverse Reactions to Food Committee of American Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology. Work Group report: oral food challenge

testing. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2009;**123**(6 Suppl):S365-83.

29. Komata T, Shukuya A, Imai T, Tachimoto H, Ebisawa M. [Single blind food challenge using dried food powder—1 st report. Raw whole egg and egg yolk]. *Arerugi* 2009;**58**: 524-36 (in Japanese).

30. Rancé F, Deschildre A, Villard-Truc F *et al*, and SFAIC and SP2A Workgroup on OFC in Children. Oral food challenge in children: an expert review. *Eur Ann Allergy Clin Immunol* 2009;**41**:35-49.

31. Shimakura K, Nagashima Y, Shiomi K *et al*. [In vitro evaluation of allergenicity of dried food powders manufactured for food provocation test]. *Arerugi* 2003;**52**:522-9 (in Japanese).

32. Savage JH, Matsui EC, Skripak JM, Wood RA. The natural history of egg allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2007; **120**:1413-7.

33. Skripak JM, Matsui EC, Mudd K, Wood RA. The natural history of IgE-mediated cow's milk allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2007;**120**:1172-7.

34. Keet CA, Matsui EC, Dhillon G, Lenehan P, Paterakis M, Wood RA. The natural history of wheat allergy. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 2009;**102**:410-5.

35. Savage JH, Limb SL, Brereton NH, Wood RA. The natural history of peanut allergy: Extending our knowledge beyond childhood. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2007;**120**:717-9.

36. Fleischer DM, Conover-Walker MK, Matsui EC, Wood RA. The natural history of tree nut allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2005;**116**:1087-93.

37. Perry TT, Matsui EC, Conover-Walker MK, Wood RA. Risk of oral food challenges. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2004; **114**:1164-8.

38. Nowak-Wegrzyn A, Bloom KA, Sicherer SH *et al*. Tolerance to extensively heated milk in children with cow's milk allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2008;**122**:342-7.

39. Ogawa A, Samoto M, Takahashi K. Soybean allergens and hypoallergenic soybean products. *J Nutr Sci Vitaminol* 2000;**46**:271-9.

40. Komata T, Söderström L, Borres MP, Tachimoto H, Ebisawa M. The predictive relationship of food-specific serum IgE concentrations to challenge outcomes for egg and milk varies by patient age. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2007;**119**:1272-4.

41. Maloney JM, Rudengren M, Ahlstedt S, Bock SA, Sampson HA. The use of serum-specific IgE measurements for the diagnosis of peanut, tree nut, and seed allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2008;**122**:145-51.

42. Sampson HA. Utility of food-specific IgE concentrations in predicting symptomatic food allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2001;**107**:891-6.

43. Eigenmann PA, Sampson HA. Interpreting skin prick tests in the evaluation of food allergy in children. *Pediatr Allergy Immunol* 1998;**9**:186-91.

44. Verstege A, Mehl A, Rolinck-Werninghaus C *et al*. The predictive value of the skin prick test wheal size for the outcome of oral food challenges. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2005; **35**:1220-6.

45. Ogata M, Sukuya A, Sugizaki C *et al*. [Usefulness of skin prick test using bifurcated needle for the diagnosis of food allergy in infantile atopic dermatitis—1st report. Case of egg allergy]. *Arerugi* 2008;**57**:843-52 (in Japanese).

46. Nishi H, Nishimura S, Higashiura M *et al*. A new method for histamine release from purified peripheral blood basophils using monoclonal antibody-coated magnetic beads. *J Immunol Methods* 2000;**240**:39-46.

47. Iwasaki E, Yamaura M, Masuda K *et al*. [Diagnostic value of glass microfibre-based basophil histamine release test in food allergic children. Comparison with specific IgE antibody and skin scratch test]. *Arerugi* 1994;**43**:609-18 (in Japanese).

48. Wood RA. Oral food challenge testing. In: Adkinson NF Jr, Bochner BS, Busse WW *et al* (eds). *Middleton's Allergy Principles & Practice,* 7th edn. Philadelphia: Mosby Elsevier, 2009;1309-17.

49. Taylor SL, Hefle SL, Bindslev-Jensen C *et al*. A consensus protocol for the determination of the threshold doses for allergenic foods: how much is too much? *Clin Exp Allergy* 2004;**34**:689-95.

50. Devenney I, Norrman G, Oldaeus G, Strömberg L, Fälth-Magnusson K. A new model for low-dose food challenge in children with allergy to milk or egg. *Acta Paediatr* 2006;**95**:1133-9.

51. Ito K, Futamura M, Takaoka Y, Morishita M, Nakanishi K, Sakamoto T. [Open food challenge with milk, egg white and wheat]. *Arerugi* 2008;**57**:1043-52 (in Japanese).

52. James JM. Respiratory manifestations of food allergy. *Pediatrics* 2003;**111**:1625-30.

53. De Swert LF, Bullens D, Raes M, Dermaux AM. Anaphylaxis in referred pediatric patients: demographic and clinical features, triggers, and therapeutic approach. *Eur J Pediatr* 2008;**167**:1251-61.

54. Muraro A, Roberts G, Clark A *et al*, and EAACI Task Force on Anaphylaxis in Children. The management of anaphylaxis in childhood: position paper of the European academy of allergology and clinical immunology. *Allergy* 2007;**62**:857-71.

55. Burks AW, Laubach S, Jones SM. Oral tolerance, food allergy, and immunotherapy: implications for future treatment. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2008;**121**:1344-50.

56. Hwang JB, Sohn SM, Kim AS. Prospective follow-up oral food challenge in food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome. *Arch Dis Child* 2009;**94**:425-8.

57. Niggemann B. Role of oral food challenges in the diagnostic work-up of food allergy in atopic eczema dermatitis syndrome. *Allergy* 2004;**59**(Suppl 78):32-4.

58. Järvinen KM, Mäkinen-Kiljunen S, Suomalainen H. Cow's milk challenge through human milk evokes immune responses in infants with cow's milk allergy. *J Pediatr* 1999; **135**:506-12.

59. Rance F, Dutau G. Labial food challenge in children with food allergy. *Pediatr Allergy Immunol* 1997;**8**:41-4.

Molecular diagnosis of egg allergy

Jean-Christoph Caubet[a,b], Yasuto Kondo[c], Atsuo Urisu[c] and
Anna Nowak-Węgrzyn[a]

[a]Jaffe Food Allergy Institute, Department of Pediatrics, Division of Allergy and Immunology, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, USA, [b]University Hospitals of Geneva and Medical School of the University of Geneva, Department of Child and Adolescent, Geneva, Switzerland and [c]Department of Pediatrics, The Second Teaching Hospital, Fujita Health University, Nagoya, Japan

Correspondence to Anna Nowak-Węgrzyn, MD, Department of Pediatrics, Division of Allergy and Immunology, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, Box 1198, New York City, NY 10029, USA Tel: +1 212 241 5548; fax: +1 212 426 1902; e-mail: anna.nowak-wegrzyn@mssm.edu

Purpose of review

Allergy to hen's egg is common in infancy and childhood. Oral food challenges are often required to diagnose egg allergy, because of the limitation in the diagnostic accuracy of skin test and specific IgE to egg white. New molecular diagnostic technologies have been recently introduced into allergological research. In this article, we will review the recent literature regarding the potential value of these tests for the clinical management of egg-allergic patients.

Recent findings

Component-resolved diagnosis that can be combined with the microarray technology is promising as measurement of specific IgE antibodies to individual egg white components has been shown to predict different clinical patterns of egg allergy. Specific IgE to ovomucoid has been identified as a risk factor for persistent allergy and could indicate reactivity to heated egg. Ovomucoid and ovalbumin IgE and IgG4-binding epitope profiling could also help distinguish different clinical phenotypes of egg allergy. Particularly, egg-allergic patients with IgE antibodies reacting against sequential epitopes tend to have more persistent allergy.

Summary

Using recombinant allergens, IgE-binding epitopes, and microarrays, molecular-based technologies show promising results. However, none of these tests is ready to be used in clinical practice and oral food challenge remains the standard for the diagnosis of egg allergy.

Keywords

allergy, component, diagnosis, egg, microarray

Introduction

After cow's milk, hen's egg allergy is the second most common food allergy in infants and young children [1–5]. A recent meta-analysis [6] of the prevalence of food allergy estimated that egg allergy affects 0.5–2.5% of young children. Egg allergy is closely associated with atopic dermatitis and was found to be present in about two-thirds of children with positive oral food challenges (OFCs) performed for allergy evaluation of atopic dermatitis [7]. The risks of sensitization to aeroallergens [8] and asthma [9] are also increased in egg-allergic children. The prognosis of egg allergy in young children is favorable and the majority of cases resolve within first years of life [10,11]. Today, the standard therapy for egg allergy is strict avoidance [12]. However, hen's egg is a versatile ingredient used in the cooking of many cultures, including a wide range of manufactured food products and the dietary avoidance of egg can thus be challenging [13].

Correct diagnosis of egg allergy is an absolute prerequisite for appropriate and potentially lifesaving preventive measures. The current tools available for diagnosis of egg allergy include the clinical history, physical examination, prick skin test and specific IgE to egg white. None of these parameters achieved sufficiently high predictive values and thus the majority of children still need to undergo clinician-supervised OFC to determine the clinical relevance of IgE sensitization. However, OFCs are resource-consuming and associated with a risk for severe anaphylaxis [14]. Although it has been shown that sensitivity and specificity of skin prick tests could be optimized using the end point titration approach [15], new testing methodologies are still needed for determining the presence and severity as well as the likelihood of resolution of egg allergy. Molecular diagnostic technologies have been recently introduced into allergological research as promising tools. Instead of measuring the IgE response to complex allergen extracts, specific responses on the level of individual allergens ('component-resolved diagnosis') or the epitopes of those allergens ('epitope mapping or profiling') are evaluated. We will discuss the potential role of these tools in the diagnosis of egg allergy.

DOI:10.1097/ACI.0b013e3283464d1b