



## King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1016/j.anai.2017.06.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anai.2017.06.013)

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Li, P. H., Gunawardana, N., Thomas, I., Ue, K. L., Siew, L., Watts, T. J., Bintcliffe, K., Haque, R., Rutkowski, K., Skypala, I., & Till, S. J. (2017). Sesame allergy in adults: Investigation and outcomes of oral food challenges. *Annals of Allergy Asthma and Immunology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anai.2017.06.013>

### **Citing this paper**

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## TITLE PAGE

### **Sesame Allergy In Adults: Investigation And Outcomes Of Oral Food Challenges**

Philip H. Li MRes(Med), MRCP<sup>a,b</sup>; Natasha Gunawardana MRCP<sup>c</sup>; Iason Thomas MRCP<sup>a</sup>; Kok Loong Ue MRCP<sup>a</sup>; Leonard Siew PhD MRCP<sup>a</sup>; Timothy J. Watts MRCP<sup>a</sup>; Keyna Bintcliffe RN<sup>a</sup>; Rubaiyat Haque FRCP<sup>a</sup>; Krzysztof Rutkowski MD, MRCP<sup>a</sup>; Isabel Skypala PhD, RD<sup>c\*</sup>; and Stephen J. Till, PhD, FRCP<sup>a,d,e\*</sup>.

\* Both authors contributed equally to this work

<sup>a</sup>Department of Allergy, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, Great Maze Pond, London, United Kingdom.

<sup>b</sup>Division of Rheumatology and Clinical Immunology, Department of Medicine, Queen Mary Hospital, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

<sup>c</sup>Department of Allergy, Royal Brompton and Harefield NHS Foundation Trust, Fulham Road, London, United Kingdom.

<sup>d</sup>Division of Asthma, Allergy and Lung Biology, Kings College London, School of Medicine, Guys Hospital, London, United Kingdom.

<sup>e</sup>Medical Research Council and Asthma UK Centre for Allergic Mechanisms of Asthma

**Corresponding author:** Dr. Stephen J Till  
Division of Asthma, Allergy and Lung Biology  
Kings College London, School of Medicine  
Guys Hospital  
London SE1 9RT  
Tel: 020 7188 0599 Fax: 020 7403 8640  
E-mail: stephen.till@kcl.ac.uk

**Tables: 1. Figures: None.**

**Word count: 991**

**Conflict of interest: None.**

**Funding source: None.**

**Trial registration: Not applicable**

**Key Words:** Sesame, IgE, skin prick test, food allergy, oral food challenge, anaphylaxis.

1 Sesame (*Sesamum indicum*) allergy is the most common seed allergy and has been increasingly  
2 reported worldwide (1). The variation in prevalence between populations is likely due to  
3 different food habits and awareness. Similar to peanut, IgE-mediated sesame allergy begins early  
4 in life (usually before 2 years) and persists in 80% of patients (2). Clinical manifestations range  
5 from mucocutaneous, respiratory and gastrointestinal manifestations to life-threatening systemic  
6 anaphylaxis. Accurate diagnosis of sesame allergy is therefore crucial but the value of skin prick  
7 tests (SPT) and sesame-specific IgE (sIgE) have been questioned. Previous studies, largely  
8 performed in children, suggest that neither tests sufficiently predict true allergy as determined by  
9 oral food challenges (OFC) (3-5). This is of particular concern as anaphylaxis in adult patients  
10 with both negative SPTs and sIgE have been reported (3). We performed a retrospective  
11 evaluation of the utility of SPT, sIgE and other clinical parameters in predicting sesame allergy  
12 confirmed by OFC in adults.

13 We reviewed the clinical data of all patients who had undergone sesame OFC at Guy's & St.  
14 Thomas' and Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Foundation Trusts, (London, United Kingdom)  
15 between 2010 and 2016. SPT were performed with a variety of sesame-containing products  
16 including a commercially available solution (Allergopharma, Germany), or prick-to-prick testing  
17 with sesame seeds, Sesame Snaps (Anglo-Dal Ltd, UK), sesame oil, halva and/or tahini. When  
18 multiple reagents for SPT were used, the result with the largest wheal diameter was used for  
19 analyses. sIgE to sesame seed antibody was performed with the ImmunoCAP system (Phadia,  
20 Sweden). All patients underwent OFC with sesame seeds, Sesame Snaps, sesame oil or tahini.  
21 The starting dose, subsequent increments, interval times and a decision to obtain intravenous  
22 access were individualized for each patient after a clinical assessment. Severity of reactions was  
23 retrospectively graded from the clinical records according to Ring and Messmer's classification

24 (6). Association analysis with the Fisher's exact test and independent samples t-test were used to  
25 compare categorical and continuous variables between sesame allergic/non-allergic patients  
26 respectively.

27

28 Over the 6-year study period, records were available for 33 patients who underwent supervised  
29 sesame OFC. Overall, the median age was 32 (range: 16-81) years and the male:female ratio was  
30 1:2. Sixteen (48%), 12 (36%), and 10 (30%) patients had history of allergic rhinitis, asthma and  
31 atopic dermatitis respectively. Twenty-one patients (64%) had a suggestive history of reactions  
32 after exposure to sesame-containing foods, while the remainder did not have a clear or previous  
33 exposure to sesame. Eleven patients (33%) had positive SPT, defined as wheal diameter  $\geq 3$ mm;  
34 13 patients (39%) had positive sIgE, defined as  $\geq 0.35$ kUA/l; and 9 (27%) patients had both  
35 positive SPT and sIgE. There were 10 (30%) positive challenges and further information is  
36 summarized in Table 1. Half of patients (5/10) with positive OFC had reactions of grade  $\geq 3$  in  
37 severity either during their index reaction or OFC. Two serious reactions (patients #1 and #4)  
38 required 2 doses of intramuscular adrenaline for refractory hypotension.

39

40 Association analyses showed no significant differences in age ( $p=0.41$ ); gender ( $p=0.24$ ); history  
41 of reaction to sesame ( $p=0.26$ ), atopy (allergic rhinitis [ $p=0.06$ ], asthma [ $p=0.06$ ], atopic  
42 dermatitis [ $p=0.12$ ]), other food allergies ( $p=0.06$ ) or mean SPT diameters ( $p=0.06$ ) and sIgE  
43 values ( $p=0.25$ ) between patients with positive and negative OFC. Moreover, the absolute mean  
44 SPT wheal diameters and sIgE values were smaller in the positive ( $0.3 \pm 1.0$ mm,  $0.16 \pm 0.29$ kUA/l)  
45 than negative OFC group ( $1.4 \pm 1.6$ mm,  $2.00 \pm 4.85$ kUA/l). In this selected cohort, SPT had a

46 sensitivity of 10.0% and specificity of 56.5% (diameter  $\geq 3$ mm as cut-off); and sIgE had a  
47 sensitivity of 10.0% and specificity of 42.9% ( $\geq 0.35$ kUA/l as cut-off).

48

49 To the best of our knowledge, we present the largest cohort of sesame challenges performed in  
50 adults. There were no significant differences in SPT, sIgE results or studied clinical parameters  
51 between allergic and non-allergic patients. Out of 10 positive OFC, 9 (90%) had both  
52 undetectable sIgE and negative SPT despite using a variety of different sesame sources,  
53 highlighting the poor discriminative value of these tests and the importance of OFC. We  
54 recommend sesame OFC in cases with a suggestive clinical history but negative SPT/IgE testing  
55 and only after evaluation of risk/benefits for each individual patient. We also advise cautious  
56 graded protocols and consideration of prophylactic cannulation.

57 The poor sensitivity of sesame tests may be due to a lack of clinically relevant allergens in  
58 testing agents. Leduc *et al.* identified hydrophobic oleosins (Ses i 4 and Ses i 5) as major sesame  
59 allergens and sensitization to oleosins seem to be associated with more severe systemic reactions  
60 (2). The poor performance of SPT with commercial extracts may be attributed to the paucity of  
61 oleosins. Analogous to peanuts, the roasting process may increase the allergenicity of sesame  
62 proteins and tahini (a toasted oil-based sesame seed paste) might therefore represent an  
63 alternative agent for SPT (7). However, we did not find tahini to confer any additional value  
64 compared to other sesame sources, with all 7 patients tested with tahini in the positive OFC  
65 group having negative SPT results.

66 Various sesame preparations are available for OFC and no evidence for superiority of any one  
67 form. From our experience, we recommend Sesame Snaps as a palatable and convenient

68 preparation which has reliably lead to positive challenges. The utility of additional investigations  
69 such as basophil activation tests, “contact test” with sesame oil, and component-resolved  
70 diagnosis with Ses i 1 warrant further investigation (8-10).

71 Our study is limited by its retrospective nature and non-standardized use of various sesame  
72 sources for SPT and OFC. Using the largest value for SPT (when multiple results were available)  
73 for analysis may lead to under-estimation of specificity.

74 In conclusion, our study adds to previous reports and confirms that SPT and sIgE results are not  
75 predictive of sesame allergy in adults. No studied clinical parameters were different between  
76 allergic and non-allergic patients. OFC remains essential for diagnosis, but should be conducted  
77 cautiously under experienced supervision due to the inherent severity and unpredictability of  
78 sesame reactions. Further work to improve the diagnostic accuracy of skin and serum testing is  
79 needed.

## **References**

1. Gangur V, Kelly C, Navuluri L. Sesame allergy: a growing food allergy of global proportions? *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol.* 2005;95(1):4-11.
2. Cohen A, Goldberg M, Levy B, Leshno M, Katz Y. Sesame food allergy and sensitization in children: the natural history and long-term follow-up. *Pediatr Allergy Immunol.* 2007;18(3):217-23.
3. Kanny G, De Hauteclocque C, Moneret-Vautrin DA. Sesame seed and sesame seed oil contain masked allergens of growing importance. *Allergy.* 1996;51(12):952-7.
4. Leduc V, Moneret-Vautrin DA, Tzen JT, Morisset M, Guerin L, Kanny G. Identification of oleosins as major allergens in sesame seed allergic patients. *Allergy.* 2006;61(3):349-56.
5. Permaul P, Stutius LM, Sheehan WJ et al. Sesame allergy: role of specific IgE and skin-prick testing in predicting food challenge results. *Allergy Asthma Proc.* 2009;30(6):643-8.
6. Ring J, Messmer K. Incidence and severity of anaphylactoid reactions to colloid volume substitutes. *Lancet.* 1977;1(8009):466-9.
7. Della-Torre E, Pignatti P, Yacoub MR, Sabbadini MG, Colombo G. In vivo tests with "Tahini" sauce: new allergenic source to evaluate IgE-mediated hypersensitivity to sesame. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol.* 2013;110(3):209-10.
8. Alonzi C, Campi P, Gaeta F, Pineda F, Romano A. Diagnosing IgE-mediated hypersensitivity to sesame by an immediate-reading "contact test" with sesame oil. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2011;127(6):1627-9.

9. Raap U, Wieczorek D, Schenck F, Kapp A, Wedi B. The basophil activation test is a helpful diagnostic tool in anaphylaxis to sesame with false-negative specific IgE and negative skin test. *Allergy*. 2011;66(11):1497-9.
10. Maruyama N, Nakagawa T, Ito K et al. Measurement of specific IgE antibodies to Ses i 1 improves the diagnosis of sesame allergy. *Clin Exp Allergy*. 2016;46(1):163-71.



**Table 1 – Clinical summaries of 10 patients with positive oral food challenges**

#	Sex /age	Grade	Index reaction	Atopy; other food allergies	SPT wheal diameter (source)*	sIgE, kUA/l	Cumulative dose	OFC Reaction	Treatment
1	F/30	1	Rash over hands/face, loss of consciousness	Nil; nil	0mm (solution)	<0.35	6.5g (seed)	Perioral tingling, palpitations, flushing, hypotension (SBP 70mmHg)	2 doses of IM Adrenaline, IV anti-histamines and corticosteroids.
2	F/39	2	Tongue swelling with throat constriction, generalised urticaria	Nil; nil	0mm (solution, seed, tahini)	<0.35	1.75g (Sesame Snaps)	Urticaria	IV anti-histamines and corticosteroids
3	M/43	2	Neck rash, abdominal pain, generalized swelling, throat tightness, dyspnoea	Nil; nil	0mm (solution, oil, sesame snaps, halva)	<0.35	6.6g (Sesame Snaps)	Urticaria, flushing	Oral anti-histamines and corticosteroids
4	M/16	3	Sesame naïve, history of contact rash in infancy	Allergic rhinitis, asthma, atopic dermatitis; peanut and egg	3mm (solution)	0.91	6.5g (Sesame Snaps)	Urticaria, facial angioedema, hypotension (SBP 60mmHg)	2 doses of IM Adrenaline, IV anti-histamines and corticosteroids
5	F/16	3	Urticaria, facial swelling	Nil; nil	0mm (solution, oil, seed, tahini)	<0.35	1ml (sesame oil)	Palmar erythema, pruritus, coughing with wheeze on auscultation (PEFR 480 → 360l/min)	Salbutamol nebuliser, oral anti-histamines and corticosteroids
6	F/27	3	Flushing, pruritus, diarrhoea (after non-specific foods)	Nil; soy	0mm (seed, tahini)	<0.35	¼ tablespoon (tahini)	Urticaria, abdominal pain	-
7	F/35	3	Facial swelling, throat tightness, hypotension	Nil; nil	0mm (seed, oil, tahini)	<0.35	5ml (tahini)	Urticaria	-
8	M/50	2	Generalized pruritus, lip swelling, throat tightness	Nil; nil	0mm (tahini)	<0.35	0.25ml (tahini)	Urticaria	Oral anti-histamines
9	M/54	3	Facial swelling, dyspnoea, feeling faint	Allergic rhinitis; nil	0mm (seed, oil, tahini, oil skin test)	<0.35	1ml (tahini)	Urticaria, periorbital angioedema	Oral anti-histamines and oral steroids
10	M/32	1	Flushing, facial swelling	Nil; nil	0mm (seed, tahini)	<0.35	5ml (tahini)	Urticaria, flushing	Oral anti-histamines

\* SPT values (with exception to patient #4) for all tested allergens were all 0mm