
Safety of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors while receiving venom immunotherapy

Kevin M. White, MD, and Ronald W. England, MD

Background: Case reports have raised concern about concurrent use of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors (ACE-Is) in patients receiving venom immunotherapy (VIT). No surveys have been performed on the number of venom allergic patients who take ACE-Is and their outcomes.

Objective: To survey the use of ACE-Is and systemic reaction (SR) characteristics in patients receiving VIT.

Methods: A retrospective medical record review was performed on all patients evaluated for Hymenoptera venom allergy at a single center from 2000 to 2005. Patient records were evaluated for presenting symptoms, specific IgE testing, VIT treatment course, ACE-I use during VIT, and the presence of any SRs to field stings or VIT.

Results: Of 288 patients evaluated from 2000 to 2005 for Hymenoptera venom allergy, 157 were found to have venom specific IgE. Of these 157 patients, 79 (50%) of those with Hymenoptera venom allergy underwent VIT. Seventeen of these 79 patients (21%) were taking an ACE-I during VIT. The mean overlap of a patient taking an ACE-I with the time they were receiving VIT was 30.9 months (range, 3–114 months). Patients taking ACE-Is were older (mean age, 56.2 vs 36.4 years; $P < .001$) and received VIT for a longer period (mean, 72.3 vs 29.9 months; $P < .04$). Thirteen of 62 patients not taking an ACE-I (21%) experienced an SR during their VIT. No patients taking an ACE-I experienced an SR to VIT while taking an ACE-I ($P = .03$).

Conclusions: This study suggests that there is not an association between ACE-I use and increased frequency of SRs to venom immunotherapy.

Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol. 2008;101:426–430.

INTRODUCTION

Venom immunotherapy (VIT) is life saving for venom-induced anaphylaxis.¹ Data have emerged during the last 2 decades regarding a potential risk for venom allergic patients who take angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors (ACE-Is). It is not known whether this risk is potentially extended to other patients at risk for anaphylaxis. Several case reports have been published of severe systemic reactions (SRs) in venom allergic individuals to either VIT or field stings when taking ACE-Is.^{2–5} In 2 of the reported cases, reactions ceased when the ACE-I was withheld for at least 24 hours before VIT injection, then recurred when the ACE-I was reintroduced.² The other case reports described severe SRs in patients taking an ACE-I at the time of a Hymenoptera sting, but a rechallenge was not performed after stopping use of the ACE-I.^{3–5}

Several studies have demonstrated a correlation between decreased levels of serum angiotensin I and II and increased

risk for more severe Hymenoptera anaphylaxis and increased incidence of VIT failure.^{6–9} It has also been found that serum levels of angiotensin I and II approached those of healthy controls in allergic patients after successful VIT.^{7,8} Urinary angiotensin I and II levels have been found to be elevated in patients shortly after anaphylactoid reactions; this observation has been suspected to be due to release during stress.¹⁰ ACE-Is have been implicated as a possible cause or contributor to anaphylactoid reactions in dialysis patients using high-flux dialysis membranes through increased bradykinin levels.^{11–15}

In reflecting on these data, the Stinging Insect Hypersensitivity Practice Parameter¹ and ACE-I package inserts¹⁶ mention a possible increased risk of SR to VIT when patients are concomitantly taking an ACE-I. Because the clinically driven end points for these statements appear to be limited to case reports, we elected to explore this question more thoroughly by examining ACE-I use and clinical outcomes in a population of patients receiving VIT at a single medical center.

METHODS

At our medical center, records are kept of all venom allergy clinic referrals. In addition, an electronic medical record has been in existence for patients followed up in the allergy clinic since the year 2000. After local institutional review board approval, this record was queried from the years 2000 to 2005 to examine patients who had been evaluated for venom allergy at our facility. Because we are a tertiary referral center, some of our patients are referred for venom evaluation from outside the area. Patients receiving VIT from outside the area

Affiliations: Allergy/Immunology Clinic, Wilford Hall Medical Center, San Antonio, Texas.

Disclosures: Authors have nothing to disclose.

Disclaimer: The opinions and assertions contained herein are the private views of the authors and are not to be construed as reflecting the views of the US Department of the Air Force, the US Department of Defense, or the US government.

Previous Presentation: Data from this letter were presented as a 10-minute slide presentation during the 2007 meeting of the American College of Allergy, Asthma and Clinical Immunology in Dallas, Texas, November 2007. It has not been otherwise disseminated or published.

Received for publication March 19, 2008; Received in revised form June 4, 2008; Accepted for publication June 15, 2008.

were not followed up in this study. Review and recording of information from the electronic medical record included patient demographics, presenting symptoms, specific IgE testing (skin and/or serologic testing), treatment course, SR to VIT (as documented by the allergist), and SR to field stings (as reported during the VIT by the patient during follow-up). In assessing the presenting symptoms and the subsequent SRs to VIT and field stings, the following anaphylaxis classification was used: grade 1, cutaneous symptoms only (eg, urticaria and/or angioedema); grade 2, cutaneous symptoms and evidence of other system involvement but not hypoxia or hypotension (eg, urticaria and wheezing); and grade 3, multisystem involvement, including hypotension or hypoxia.¹⁷ Flying Hymenoptera are first tested with skin prick testing at 1 $\mu\text{g/mL}$. If the results are negative, intradermals (IDs) are placed: first ID, 0.001 $\mu\text{g/mL}$; second ID, 0.01 $\mu\text{g/mL}$; third ID, 0.1 $\mu\text{g/mL}$; and fourth ID, 1 $\mu\text{g/mL}$; stopping when a positive test result occurs or the patient reaches the last ID test. Imported fire ant testing is performed with whole body extract with corresponding doses as follows: prick, 1:1,000 wt/vol; first ID, 1:1,000,000 wt/vol; second ID, 1:100,000 wt/vol; third ID, 1:10,000 wt/vol; and fourth ID, 1:1,000 wt/vol. The patients' demographic information was cross-referenced with our medical center's electronic pharmacy database to determine the type and duration of ACE-I therapy if prescribed. An ACE-I was considered to be taken if it was prescribed with refills and if at least 1 refill was obtained. In our clinic, we do not routinely stop ACE-I therapy in patients receiving VIT. For statistical analysis, the Student *t* test was used to evaluate the significance of differences in age, sex, and length of time receiving immunotherapy between groups, and the Fisher exact test was used to evaluate the difference in SR between the 2 groups.

RESULTS

Of 288 patients evaluated from 2000 to 2005 for Hymenoptera venom allergy, 157 were found to have specific IgE (90 to imported fire ant, 54 to yellow jacket, 54 to hornet, 60 to wasp, and 43 to honeybee; many patients had a positive skin test result to more than one). VIT was recommended for patients with a history of a SR and evidence of venom specific IgE, with the exception of patients younger than 16 years who had grade 1 reactions only.¹ Seventy-nine of the 157 allergic patients (50%) underwent VIT at our facility. An overview of the patients who underwent VIT is given in Table 1. Seventeen of the 79 patients receiving VIT (21%) took an ACE-I during their immunotherapy (Table 2). The average overlap of a patient taking an ACE-I with the time they were receiving VIT was 30.9 months (range, 3–114 months). Fifteen patients took lisinopril, 6 took ramipril, and 1 patient took benazepril (5 patients took more than 1 ACE-I during VIT). Of the 17 patients receiving ACE-Is and VIT, 10 patients started taking the ACE-I after starting VIT (1 during buildup) and 7 patients continued taking the ACE-I at the time VIT was started. Patients taking ACE-Is were significantly older (mean age, 56.2 vs 36.4 years; $P < .001$) and

Table 1. Overview of Patients Receiving Venom Immunotherapy at our Facility in 2000–2005

Variable	No. (%) of patients (n = 79) ^a
Age, mean (SD), y	36.4 (16.8)
Male	46/79 (58)
Asthmatic	20/79 (25)
Reaction at presentation ^b	
Grade 1	10/79 (13)
Grade 2	57/79 (72)
Grade 3	12/79 (15)
Hymenoptera monosensitized	48/79 (61)
Imported fire ant	36/48 (75)
Honeybee	7/48 (15)
Wasp	4/48 (8)
Yellow jacket	1/48 (2)
Hornet	0/48 (0)
Hymenoptera polysensitized	31/79 (39)
Imported fire ant and flying insect	8/31 (26)
Mixed flying insect	23/31 (74)
No. of months receiving VIT, mean (SD)	39 (46)

Abbreviation: VIT, venom immunotherapy

^a Data are presented as number (percentage) of patients unless otherwise indicated.

^b See the "Methods" section for an explanation of the presenting reactions (grades 1–3).

received VIT for a longer period than those who were not taking an ACE-I (mean, 72.3 vs 29.9 months; $P < .04$). Of the 17 patients taking ACE-Is, 14 had the concentration at which their skin test result became positive recorded (82%). Those without a level were recorded as having a positive result. Of those 14 patients, their average skin test response (using the more sensitive result if there were multiple positive results) was between the first and second ID tests (0.001 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ and 0.01 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ for flying Hymenoptera, 1:1,000,000 wt/vol and 1:100,000 for imported fire ant). Of the 62 patients not taking ACE-Is, 44 had the level at which their skin test result turned positive recorded (71%). Of those 44 patients, their average skin test response was also between the first and second ID tests.

Thirteen of 62 patients (21%) not taking an ACE-I experienced an SR to VIT during their VIT. No patient taking an ACE-I experienced an SR to VIT or field stings while taking an ACE-I ($P = .03$) (Table 3). In the 13 patients not taking ACE-Is who had SRs to VIT, 8 had symptoms of a similar grade on SR (all were grade 2), 4 had symptoms of a lesser grade, and 1 patient who had grade 1 symptoms on presentation had grade 2 symptoms on SR to VIT. Twenty-two of the 62 patients (35%) not taking an ACE-I reported having a field sting during their VIT course, and 5 of the 22 (23%) had an SR to the sting. In the 5 patients not taking ACE-Is who had SRs to a field sting, 4 had symptoms of a lesser grade on SR and 1 patient who had grade 2 symptoms on presentation had grade 2 symptoms on field sting. Twelve of the 17 patients (71%) taking an ACE-I reported having field stings,

Table 2. Patients Receiving Venom Immunotherapy Taking ACE-Is

Patient No./sex/age, y	Grade at presentation ^a	Type of VIT	VIT duration, mo	Overlap with ACE-I, mo	Timing of ACE-I introduction in relation to VIT
1/M/38	1	IFA	16	11	Receiving VIT maintenance
2/F/51	2	IFA/W/YJ/H	28	28	25 months prior
3/F/63	2	HB	82	62	27 months prior
4/M/52	2	IFA	46	3	During buildup
5/M/76	2	IFA	251	114	Receiving VIT maintenance
6/M/58	2	HB	66	56	Receiving VIT maintenance
7/M/60	2	W/YJ/H	42	42	116 months prior
8/F/54	2	IFA	63	42	Receiving VIT maintenance
9/M/46	2	W/YJ/H	60	29	Receiving VIT maintenance
10/F/69	2	HB	59	59	11 months prior
11/F/66	2	IFA	6	6	9 months prior
12/M/46 ^b	2	IFA	120	4	Receiving VIT maintenance
13/M/58	2	HB/W/YJ/H	26	26	32 months prior
14/M/47	3	W/YJ/H	43	28	Receiving VIT maintenance
15/F/60	3	IFA	36	3	Receiving VIT maintenance
16/F/44	3	IFA	4	4	74 months prior
17/F/68	3	HB/YJ/H	282	9	Receiving VIT maintenance

Abbreviations: VIT, venom immunotherapy; ACE-I, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; IFA, imported fire ant; W, wasp; YJ, yellow jacket; H, hornet; HB, honeybee.

^a See the "Methods" section for an explanation of the presenting symptoms (grade 1–3).

^b This patient had a systemic reaction to a field sting before ACE-I use. Sting challenge while taking an ACE-I was tolerated with no reaction.

Table 3. Systemic Reaction Rate During Hymenoptera Immunotherapy

Variable	No ACE-Is (n = 62)	ACE-Is (n = 17)
Field stings, No. (%)	22 (35)	12 (71)
Systemic reaction to field sting, No. (%)	5 (23)	0
Duration of immunotherapy, mean (SD), mo ^a	29.9 (26.4)	72.3 (78.6)
Systemic reaction to immunotherapy, No.(%) ^b	13 (21)	0

Abbreviation: ACE-I, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor.

^a $P < .04$.

^b $P = .03$.

and no patient had an SR while taking the ACE-I. One patient in the ACE-I group had an SR to a field sting early in his VIT to imported fire ant before given an ACE-I. The patient was then subsequently given an ACE-I by his primary care physician. To evaluate his level of risk, the patient underwent an imported fire ant sting challenge while taking the ACE-I and did not experience an SR (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

Anaphylaxis to Hymenoptera venom can be fatal. Allergists can offer safe and effective treatment in the form of VIT to decrease the risk for anaphylaxis in allergic patients.¹ Any factor that may alter the safety or efficacy of VIT should be identified and considered within the context of adequate risk and benefit communication. ACE-Is have been identified as potentially increasing the risk for anaphylaxis in venom allergic patients. The mechanisms are not known with certainty, and it is not known if venom allergic patients are at particular risk or if the risk extends to all patients at risk for

anaphylaxis. Avoiding ACE-I use has even been recommended by some authors for all patients at risk for anaphylaxis.¹⁸ This may raise concern among physicians who may advise the patient to seek another treatment for their cardiovascular condition. ACE-Is have significant proven morbidity and mortality benefits for patients with cardiovascular and renal disease.¹⁹ Any decision to withhold this important class of medication should ideally be firmly grounded in evidence-based medicine. Thus far, there are limited data questioning the safety of ACE-I use in conjunction with VIT^{2–5,20} or aeroallergen immunotherapy.²¹ Only 2 of the 5 reported cases implicating ACE-Is had a repeat SR when the ACE-I was reintroduced.² In those 2 cases, the ACE-I was enalapril, which was not prescribed to patients followed up in this study. In the remaining 3 cases, a rechallenge was not performed.^{3–5} Some laboratory data demonstrated that low plasma and urine angiotensin I and II levels were associated with more severe venom anaphylaxis.^{6–10} However, no data have linked measurement of angiotensin I or II in venom

allergic patients taking an ACE-I with subsequent clinical correlation. In balance of the small number of cases reported, all cases of anaphylaxis were severe, including 1 death.⁵ Our retrospective multiyear review of a closed population that included patients receiving both VIT and ACE-Is did not find an increased risk in these patients. Regardless of the observation or speculation that venom allergic patients may have abnormal renin-angiotensin systems^{6–10} possibly altered by ACE-I, we did not observe adverse clinical outcomes in this group of patients.

Patients receiving fire ant whole body extract were included in the analysis of venom allergic patients because they are usually approached similarly.¹ Whole body imported fire ant extract contains relevant venom allergens that are thought to be integral for efficacy. Although the venom content of whole body extract is smaller than for flying Hymenoptera, this is reflective of the fact that anaphylaxis to imported fire ant stings occurs with a smaller amount of venom (because imported fire ants have 1,000 times less venom protein per insect than do flying Hymenoptera).²²

Our study was limited by a small sample size and the differences between the 2 groups in age and duration of VIT. It was not surprising that patients taking an ACE-I were older than those who were not, because cardiovascular conditions (and indications for ACE-I use) increase with age. Older patients taking ACE-Is were receiving VIT for a much longer period than younger patients. The fact that older patients had increased field stings is likely reflective of the longer duration of their VIT course. It is conceivable that patients may choose to stop immunotherapy after experiencing an adverse reaction. With this in mind, our group of older patients tolerating VIT could possibly reflect some degree of self-selection that could have affected the low number of SRs in the older group of patients. It is difficult to separate the contribution of age and ACE-I use from these results; age alone is likely associated with the use of more cardiovascular medications. Our data are reassuring, however, in that our patients tolerated VIT and field stings while taking an ACE-I.

When one looks at the SR rate and the field sting reaction rate in patients in the non-ACE-I group, it may be observed that their rate is higher than what might be expected (SR rate of 21% and field sting reaction rate of 23%). However, not all patients had field stings (only 35% of those not taking an ACE-I); therefore, the true rate of protection is not known. It is also possible that recall bias led more patients who had field sting reactions to recall having a field sting. To compare VIT SR rates to published studies, we think it is more accurate to look at the population as a whole because studies have not typically reported whether their patients are taking ACE-Is when reporting efficacy or adverse effects. The overall SR rate of 16% (13/79) in our patient population receiving VIT is consistent with the range of previous reports of SR to VIT when evaluated as the number of patients with a SR during the entire VIT course (between 12% and 20%).^{23,24} Although our data are reassuring, the determination of the safety of ACE-I use in patients receiving VIT deserves fur-

ther study. Future trials would ideally include a larger patient population, from across different clinical settings, and should attempt to control for factors such as age and the length of time receiving VIT. With increased knowledge regarding ACE-I therapy and VIT, allergists will have an improved ability to more thoroughly address risk communication for venom immunotherapy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge Dr Anneke C. Bush for assistance with statistical analysis of the data.

REFERENCES

1. Moffitt JE, Golden DBK, Reisman RE, et al. Stinging insect hypersensitivity: a Practice Parameter update. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2004;114:869–886.
2. Tunon-de-Lara JM, Villaneuva P, Marcos M, Taytard A. ACE inhibitors and anaphylactoid reactions during venom immunotherapy. *Lancet.* 1992;340:908.
3. Ober AI, MacLean JA, Hannaway PJ. Life-threatening anaphylaxis to venom immunotherapy in a patient taking an angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2003;112:1008–1009.
4. Pillans PI, Coulter DM, Black P. Angioedema and urticaria with angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol.* 1996;51:123–126.
5. Brown SGA, Wu QX, Kelsall GRH, Heddle RJ, Baldo BA. Fatal anaphylaxis following jack jumper ant sting in southern Tasmania. *Med J Aust.* 2001;175:644–647.
6. Hermann K, von Tschirschnitz M, von Eschenbach CE, Ring J. Histamine, tryptase, norepinephrine, angiotensinogen, angiotensin-converting enzyme, angiotensin I and II in plasma of patients with hymenoptera venom anaphylaxis. *Int Arch Allergy Immunol.* 1994;104:379–384.
7. Hermann K, Ring J. The renin-angiotensin system in patients with repeated anaphylactic reactions during hymenoptera venom hypersensitization and sting challenge. *Int Arch Allergy Immunol.* 1997;112:251–256.
8. von Tschirschnitz M, von Eschenbach CE, Hermann K, Ring J. Plasma angiotensin II in patients with hymenoptera venom allergy during hypersensitization [abstract]. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 1993;91:283.
9. Hermann K, Ring J. The renin angiotensin system and hymenoptera venom anaphylaxis. *Clin Exp Allergy.* 1993;23:762–769.
10. Hermann K, Rittweger R, Ring J. Urinary excretion of angiotensin I, II, arginine vasopressin and oxytocin in patients with anaphylactoid reactions. *Clin Exp Allergy.* 1992;22:845–853.
11. Tielemans C, Madhoun P, Lenaers M, Schandene L, Goldman M, Vanherweghem JL. Anaphylactoid reactions during hemodialysis on AN69 membranes in patients receiving ACE inhibitors. *Kidney Int.* 1990;38:982–984.
12. Parnes EL, Shapiro WB. Anaphylactoid reactions in hemodialysis patients treated with the AN69 dialyzer. *Kidney Int.* 1991;40:1148–1152.
13. Schaefer RM, Fink E, Schaefer L, Barkhausen R, Kulzer P, Heidland A. Role of bradykinin in anaphylactoid reactions during hemodialyzers with AN69 dialyzers. *Am J Nephrol.* 1993;13:473–477.
14. Brunet P, Jaber K, Berland Y, Baz M. Anaphylactoid reactions during hemodialysis and hemofiltration: role of associating AN69 membrane and angiotensin I-converting enzyme inhibitors. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 1992;5:444–447.
15. Verresen L, Fink E, Lemke HD, Vanrenterghem Y. Bradykinin is a mediator of anaphylactoid reactions during hemodialysis with AN69 membranes. *Kidney Int.* 1994;45:1497–1503.
16. Kemp SF, Lieberman P. Inhibitors of angiotensin II: potential hazards for patients at risk for anaphylaxis? *Ann Allergy.* 1997;78:527–529.
17. Brown SGA. Clinical features and severity grading of anaphylaxis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2004;114:371–376.
18. Lieberman P. Anaphylaxis. *Med Clin North Am.* 2006;90:77–95.

-
19. Stojiljkovic L, Behnia R. Role of renin angiotensin system inhibitors in cardiovascular and renal protection: a lesson from clinical trials. *Curr Pharm Des.* 2007;13:1335–1345.
20. Stumpf JL, Shehab N, Patel AC. Safety of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors in patients with insect venom allergies. *Ann Pharmacother.* 2006;40:699–703.
21. Cox L, Li JT, Nelson H, Lockey R. Allergen immunotherapy: a Practice Parameter second update. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2007;120:S25–S85.
22. Feger TA, Dolen WK, Ford JL, Ponder RD, Hoffman DR, Stafford CT. Laboratory evaluation of a commercial immunoassay for fire ant allergen-specific IgE antibodies. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 1995;96:182–187.
23. Lockey RF, Turkeltaub PC, Olive ES, Hubbard JM, Baird-Warren IA, Bukantz SC. The hymenoptera venom study III: Safety of venom immunotherapy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 1990;86:775–780.
24. Mosbech H, Muller U. Side effects of insect venom immunotherapy: results from an EAACI multicenter study. *Allergy.* 2000;55:1005–1010.
- Requests for reprints should be addressed to:*
Kevin M. White, MD
Allergy/Immunology Clinic
Wilford Hall Medical Center
59th MTG/SGMOVA
2200 Bergquist Dr
Suite 1
Lackland AFB, TX 78236
E-mail: kevin.white@lakenheath.af.mil
-