



18° CONGRESSO NAZIONALE
Società Italiana di Allergologia e Immunologia Pediatrica (SIAIP)

CONIUGARE RICERCA E PRATICA CLINICA IN IMMUNO-ALLERGOLOGIA

PALERMO

3-5 GIUGNO 2016 – Dipartimento di Ingegneria Viale delle Scienze



ABSTRACT FORM

TITOLO: A DIFFICULT MANAGEMENT OF A PATIENT WITH PR10 RELATED ANAPHYLAXIS

AUTORI: Nucera Eleonora, MD and Aruanno Arianna, MD, Alessandro Buonomo, MD, Mezzacappa Simona, MD, Angela Rizzi, MD, PhD, and Schiavino Domenico, MD.

PRIMO AUTORE: Aruanno Arianna

TEL: 328.2190241 **FAX:** **E-MAIL:** aarianna@hotmail.it

DIPARTIMENTO/OSPEDALE: Policlinico A. Gemelli

POSTER ☒ **COMUNICAZIONE** ☐ **BANDO NO**

Proteins belong to pathogenesis-related (PR10) consist in Bet v 1 homologous, proteins that have an aminoacid sequence homology with the allergen Bet v 1 from birch pollen [1].

Bet v 1 is the major allergen of birch and about 50-70% of birch pollen allergic patients, usually after respiratory sensitization, report symptoms after ingestion of fruits and vegetables, as tree nuts, kiwi, soybean and those belonging to Rosaceae family (apple, pear, peach, plum, apricot, almond) and Apiaceae family (celery, carrot, fennel). Other Bet v 1 homologues include Mal d 1 from apple, Pru p 1 from peach, Pru a v 1 from cherry, Pru a r 2 from apricot, Pyr c 1 from pear, Api g 1 from celery, Dau c 1 from carrot and Cor a 1 from hazelnut [2].

Many proteins homologous to Bet v 1, in particular those present in the fruits of the Rosaceae family, are extremely labile and easily degraded by heat, oxidation, procedures of extraction, pepsin digestion and they are randomly distributed in pulp and peel [3,4]. For this reason the skin prick tests with commercial extracts of foods are less specific than those with fresh fruits and vegetables, that remain the best method for the diagnosis of food allergy in these patients [5].

Therefore PR10 allergic patients mostly experience local reactions in the oropharyngeal mucosa (oral allergy syndrome-OAS: oral itching, swelling of the lips, tongue and throat, hoarseness and laryngeal edema) after eating fresh foods, while they usually tolerate heat-processed foods as commercial fruit juices.

In literature there are few articles about PR-10 related proteins induced anaphylaxis [6-8].

We describe the case of a 30 year-old girl with perennial rhinoconjunctivitis and asthma with an aggravation from February to June, who referred OAS after the ingestion of apricot, cherry and strawberry and throat constriction, generalized urticaria, lip and palpebral oedema after eating apple, kiwi, peach, pear, pepper and juice with carrots, lemon and orange.

We performed an allergological evaluation included skin prick tests (SPT) to aeroallergens, latex, vegetables and panallergens extract (apple PR10 50 microg/ml, peach Lipid Transfer Protein 50 microg/ml and palm profiling 50 microg/ml) (Alk-Abellò, Milan, Italy) and assay of specific IgE (UniCAP, Phadia, Uppsala, Sweden) for the positive allergens. Moreover the culprit vegetables have been investigated by prick by prick method.

The patient had positive SPT to inhalant allergens (dermatophagoides, birch tree, cypress, plane, hazel tree), apple, peach, pear, kiwi, almond and hazelnut, birch and apple PR10.

The specific IgEs were positive to dermatophagoides (23 kU/l), birch (13.4 kU/l), hazel (6.39 kU/l), peach (1.74 kU/l), pear (3.06 kU/l) rPru p 1 (1.42 kU/l) and rBet v 1 (14 kU/l).

So to confirm these results, we also performed the Mal d 1 basophil activation test that resulted positive. Then she underwent a double-blind placebo-control food challenge (DBPCFC) with Golden apple without peel, which resulted positive (bronchospasm, rhinitis and conjunctivitis) at 10 gr; these symptoms receded with aerosol therapy (salbutamol and beclometasone) and intravenous treatment (methylprednisolone and clorpheniramine). DBPCFCs with other culprit fruits were not performed because the patient had had recent reactions.

The current treatment of this allergy is still based on the avoidance of the offending foods. Our patient referred that the most common food allergens avoidance was difficult and induced severe dietary restrictions with consequent metabolic imbalance. For these reasons, we tried to perform an oral desensitization treatment with a mix of the most consumed 4 apple cultivar (Stark, Golden, Fuji, Smith) in Italy on the basis of a previously published protocol [9,10].

The treatment was interrupted for the onset of severe side effects after 2 months (recurrent asthma after the ingestion of the apples).

Because in literature other authors described some attempts to PR-10 desensitization through birch immunotherapy [11-16] and one study showed [17] that such effect was rather long-lasting, we performed a birch sublingual immunotherapy (Staloral 300 IR) to our patient. After 4 years of treatment the patient resolved completely her seasonal respiratory disease and we decided to evaluate the benefits on food allergy by DBPCFCs with the culprit foods. During the challenge test, the girl presented an anaphylactic reaction characterized by cough, bronchospasm, throat ache, lips and uvula oedema, conjunctivitis and abdominal pain after 40 gr of pear without peel that receded completely after aerosol therapy (epinephrine, salbutamol and beclometasone), intramuscular treatment with epinephrine and intravenous therapy (ranitidine, methylprednisolone and clorpheniramine).

In literature we found few cases of PR-10 related proteins induced anaphylaxis. In the first report the authors described the case of a patient with history of anaphylaxis induced by hazelnuts and peaches, but in this case the allergological work-up showed a double sensitization to proteins in both PR 10 (e.g. Bet v1, Cor a1, Pru p1) and LTP14 (e.g. Pru p3, Cor a8). [8] In other study [6], the authors reported that when drinks containing PR-10

proteins rapidly consumed, for example during sporting activities, large concentrations of allergen can be reached without any intraoral symptoms and then lead to anaphylaxis. This phenomenon has often been described for soy milk, while in this case it occurred during exercise after the ingestion of an apple drink with 60% fruit concentration. In the last article other cases of anaphylaxis were described after the ingestion of soy-containing dietary food product in patients allergic to birch pollen [7].

In this case report, instead we described another case of anaphylaxis caused by an apparently harmless panallergen that usually determined OAS after DBPCFC with fresh pear.

In patients as in our case where the desensitization treatment to PR-10 or birch doesn't work, the only therapeutic solution is the elimination diet of all the culprit foods with the risk to develop metabolic imbalance.

Bolhaar et al. [18] obtained a mutant of the major apple allergen Mal d 1 (Mald1 mut) whose hypo-allergenicity was demonstrated by the DBPCFC: in fact patients stimulated with Mal d 1 mut reacted at higher dose than when stimulated with the classic Mal d 1. These observations lead to the hypothesis that patients with severe allergic reactions may benefit in the future from immunotherapy safer through the use of recombinant hypoallergenic.

Our case report emphasizes that not only well-known dangerous panallergens (nsLTP, storage proteins), but also apparently harmless proteins can be responsible for serious allergic reactions.

Therefore, we think that attending physicians should be aware of the possibility of serious allergic reactions and should be cautious in this kind of patients management.

References

- 1) Hoffmann-Sommergruber K. Plant allergens and pathogenesis-related proteins. What do they have in common? *Int Arch Allergy Immunol* 2000; 122:155-166.
- 2) Fernandez-Rivas M, Gonzales-Mancebo E, Rodriguez Perez R et al. Clinically relevant peach lipid transfer protein, Pru p 3, in the Spanish population. *J Allergy Immunol* 2003; 112:789-795.
- 3) Ahrazem O, Jimeno L, López-Torrejón G et al. Assessing allergen levels in peach and nectarine cultivars. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 2007; 99:42-7.
- 4) Rudeschko O, Fahlbusch B, Henzgen M et al. Investigation of the stability of apple allergen extracts. *Allergy* 1995; 50:575-579.
- 5) Rodrigues-Alves R, Lopez A, Pereira-Santos MC et al. Clinical, anamnestic and serological features of peach allergy in Portugal. *Int Arch Allergy Immunol* 2008; 149 (I):65-73.
- 6) Röseler S, Balakirski G, Plange J et al. Anaphylaxis to PR-10 proteins (Bet v1 homologues). *Hautarzt* 2013; 64(12):890-2.
- 7) Kleine-Tebbe J, Vogel L, Crowell DN et al. 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 (5): 797-804.
- 8) Vanstreels L, Balakirski G, Röseler S et al. Double sensitization to PR10 and PR-14 proteins. *Hautarzt* 2014; 65(12):1017-8.
- 9) Patriarca G, Nucera E, Roncallo C et al. Oral desensitizing treatment in food allergy: clinical and immunological results. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2003; 17:1205.
- 10) Nucera E, Aruanno A, Lombardo C et al. Apple desensitization in two patients with PR-10 proteins allergy. *Allergy* 2010; 65(8):1060-1.
- 11) Kazemi-Shirazi L, Pauli G, Purohit A et al. Quantitative IgE inhibition experiments with purified recombinant allergens indicate pollen-derived allergens as the sensitizing agents responsible for many forms of plant food allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2000; 105:116-25.
- 12) Asero R. Effects of birch pollen-specific immunotherapy on apple allergy in birch pollen-hypersensitivity patients. *Clin Exp Allergy* 1998; 28:1368-73.
- 13) Modzynski M, Zawisza E, Rapiejko P et al. Specific-pollen immunotherapy in the treatment of oral allergy syndrome in patients with tree pollen hypersensitivity. *Przegl Lek* 2002; 59:1007-10.
- 14) Hermann D, Henzgen M, Frank E et al. Effect of hyposensitization for tree pollinosis on associated apple allergy. *J Invest Allergol Clin Immunol* 1995; 5:259-267.
- 15) Bolhaar ST, Tiemessen MM, Zuidmeer L et al. Efficacy of birch-pollen immunotherapy on cross-reactive food allergy confirmed by skin tests and double-blind food challenges. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2004; 34:761-9.
- 16) Bucher X, Pichler WJ, Dahinden CA et al. Effect of tree pollen specific, subcutaneous immunotherapy on the oral allergy syndrome to apple and hazelnut. *Allergy* 2004; 59:1272-6.
- 17) Asero R. How long does the effect of birch pollen injection SIT on apple allergy last? *Allergy* 2003; 58: 435-8.
- 18) Bolhaar ST, Zuidmeer L, Ma Y et al. A mutant of the major apple allergen, Mal d 1, demonstrating hypoallergenicity in the target organ by double-blind placebo-controlled food challenge. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2005; 35 (12):1638-44.