

Sesame allergy: Role of specific IgE and skin-prick testing in predicting food challenge results

Perdita Permaul, M.D.,^{1,2} Lisa M. Stutius, M.D.,^{1,2} William J. Sheehan, M.D.,^{1,2}
Pitudo Rangsiethienchai, M.D., M.A.,^{1,3} Jolan E. Walter, M.D., Ph.D.,^{1,2} Frank J. Twarog, M.D., Ph.D.,^{1,2}
Michael C. Young, M.D.,^{1,2} Jordan E. Scott, M.D.,^{1,2} Lynda C. Schneider, M.D.,^{1,2} and
Wanda Phipatanakul, M.D., M.S.^{1,2}

ABSTRACT

There are conflicting data regarding the diagnostic value of sesame-specific IgE and sesame skin test. Currently, there are no established thresholds that predict clinical reactivity. We examined the correlation of sesame ImmunoCAP and skin-prick test (SPT) results with oral challenge outcomes in children suspected of having a sesame food allergy. We conducted a retrospective chart review of children, aged 2–12 years, receiving a sesame ImmunoCAP level, SPT, and food challenge from January 2004 to August 2008 at Children's Hospital Boston and affiliated allergy clinics. Food challenges were conducted in cases of questionable clinical history or a negative ImmunoCAP and/or negative SPT despite a convincing history. Thirty-three oral sesame challenges were conducted. Of the 33 challenges performed, 21% ($n = 7$) failed and 79% ($n = 26$) passed. A sesame-specific IgE level of ≥ 7 kU_A/L showed specificity of $>90\%$. An SPT wheal size of ≥ 6 mm showed specificity of $>90\%$. Receiver operator characteristic (ROC) curve analysis for sesame-specific IgE revealed an area under the curve (AUC) of 0.56. ROC curve analysis for SPT wheal size revealed an AUC of 0.67. To our knowledge, this study represents the largest number of sesame challenges performed to evaluate the diagnostic value of both sesame-specific IgE and SPT. Based on our sample, both tests are not good predictors of true sesame allergy as determined by an oral challenge. We were unable to establish a threshold with a 95% positive predictive value for both sesame-specific IgE and SPT.

(Allergy Asthma Proc 30:643–648, 2009; doi: 10.2500/aap.2009.30.3294)

Key words: Food allergy, food challenge, IgE, ImmunoCAP, oral challenge, sesame allergy, sesame skin test, skin-prick test

Sesame seed is an emerging food allergen in the U.S. pediatric population as it becomes more common in the American diet. A recent systematic review of seed allergies described a prevalence of $<1\%$ for sesame allergy as defined by a positive food challenge.¹ It has been reported that most patients have sesame allergy before the age of 2 years and $\sim 20\%$ of children with clinical allergy eventually develop tolerance.² Another study described 9 of 30 children (30%) developing tolerance at an average age of 2.8 years.³ Dalal *et al.* reported anaphylaxis as the presenting symptom in 30% of children with sesame allergy, all occurring in patients <1 year of age.⁴ This

is of significant clinical concern in children who are too young to describe their symptoms.

Clinical diagnostic tests such as food-specific IgE levels and skin-prick test (SPT) results may aid in deciding who will tolerate a food challenge compared with those who are likely to react.⁵ Diagnostic decision points for food-specific IgE antibodies have been published for common food allergens such as eggs, milk, peanuts, and fish.^{6,7} However, there are conflicting data regarding the diagnostic value of sesame-specific IgE and SPTs and currently there are no established thresholds that predict clinical reactivity. Zavalkoff *et al.* were unable to establish a sesame-specific IgE threshold with a 95% positive predictive value (PPV).⁸ In an article published by Maloney *et al.*, a fitted predicted probability curve of clinical reactivity to sesame in relation to sesame-specific IgE did not show a 90 or 95% predicted probability of a reaction.⁹ At last, Ho *et al.* identified a sesame SPT wheal diameter of ≥ 8 mm as being predictive of a positive food challenge with $>95\%$ accuracy.¹⁰

METHODS

The objective of this study was to examine the correlation of sesame-specific IgE and SPT results with the outcome of oral sesame challenges in children sus-

From the ¹Department of Medicine, Division of Allergy and Immunology, Children's Hospital Boston, Boston, Massachusetts, ²Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, and ³McGraw Medical Center, Northwestern University, Evanston Program, Evanston, Illinois

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology (AAAAI), March 13–17, 2009, Washington, DC

P. Permaul is supported by a National Institutes of Health (NIH) National Research Service Award (NRSA) grant (T32-AI-007512). W. Phipatanakul is supported by an NIH K-23 grant (AI-054972) and an NIH R-01 grant (AI-073964)

The authors had no conflicts of interest; except for what is noted previously there are no other funding sources; the authors had no institutional or corporate affiliations

Address correspondence and reprint requests to Wanda Phipatanakul, M.D., Children's Hospital Boston, Division of Allergy and Immunology, Children's Hospital Boston, 300 Longwood Avenue, Fegan Building 6th Floor, Boston, MA 02115

Copyright © 2009, OceanSide Publications, Inc., U.S.A.

pected of having a sesame allergy. Children were suspected of having a sesame allergy for a variety of reasons including a positive sesame ImmunoCAP (Phadia AB, Portage, MI) and/or SPT (Greer Laboratories, Lenoir, NC); worsening eczema with sesame ingestion; and clinical reaction to sesame such as urticaria, angioedema, respiratory distress, or gastrointestinal symptoms including emesis and diarrhea. We conducted a retrospective chart review of all children, aged 2–12 years, who received a serum sesame-specific IgE level, SPT, and oral food challenge from January 2004 to August 2008 at Children's Hospital Boston and several affiliated allergy clinics.

Oral food challenge was used as the gold standard by which performance characteristics (sensitivity, specificity, PPVs, and negative predictive values [NPVs]) of sesame-specific IgE measurements and SPT wheal size were calculated. Receiver operator characteristic (ROC) curve analysis was used to determine a threshold that would differentiate children with true sesame allergy from children who are tolerant. The relationship between sensitization status and outcome measure was analyzed using logistic regression. Fitted predicted probability curves were plotted using the results from logistic regression.

Serum samples were analyzed for sesame-specific IgE using an ImmunoCAP fluorescence enzyme immunoassay (Phadia AB). The detection limit of the assay was 0.35 kU/L. A positive ImmunoCAP test was defined as ≥ 0.35 kU/L.

SPTs were performed in a standard fashion using the Multi-Test II device from Alk-Abello (Round Rock, TX) and a commercially prepared extract from Greer Laboratories. Negative controls with saline and positive controls with histamine were performed concurrently. The mean of the longest diameter and orthogonal diameter were measured in millimeters at 15 minutes. A positive SPT was defined as a wheal diameter ≥ 3 mm larger than the negative control.

Oral food challenges were performed as graded open challenges according to recommendations of the American Academy of Asthma, Allergy, and Immunology and the American College of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology.¹¹ Sesame seeds were used for challenge. A standard graded open food challenge consisted of increasing increments every 15 minutes of 100 and 500 mg, and 1, 2, 4, and 4 g of sesame seeds. Children < 3 years of age were given increasing increments every 15 minutes of 500 mg and 1, 2, and 4 g. Symptoms that warranted cessation of a food challenge included urticaria, rhinitis, wheezing, throat itchiness, angioedema, worsening of eczema, emesis, and refusal to eat. Food challenges were conducted in cases of questionable clinical history or a negative sesame-specific IgE and/or negative SPT despite a convincing history.

RESULTS

Thirty-three oral sesame challenges were performed in 33 children. Sixty-one percent of patients had atopic dermatitis, 48% had asthma, 45% had history of anaphylaxis to another food, and 24% had a first-degree relative with food allergy. Of the 33 oral sesame challenges performed, 21% ($n = 7$) were assessed as positive and 79% ($n = 26$) as negative. Of the symptoms provoked by the oral food challenge, 71% were cutaneous, 43% were gastrointestinal, 29% involved mucous membranes, 29% involved the lower respiratory tract, and 29% manifested as anaphylaxis.

Of the 33 patients suspected of having a sesame allergy, 7 had never ingested sesame but had positive testing. Of these 7 patients, 3 failed the oral challenge (see Table 1). In addition, 9 of the 33 patients were tested *via* sesame-specific IgE level and/or SPT to confirm a clinical reaction to sesame while the remaining patients were screened because of the presence of other food allergies such as peanuts and tree nuts. The clinical allergic reactions in these nine patients included urticaria, lip swelling, possible anaphylaxis, and worsening eczema with ingestion. Interestingly, these nine patients passed the oral challenge.

Eighteen of 26 (69%) sesame-tolerant children had a positive ImmunoCAP test. Eleven (42%) sesame-tolerant children had a positive SPT. Two of seven (29%) sesame-allergic children had a negative SPT result, one of which also had a negative ImmunoCAP test (see Table 1, patient 3). This patient previously tolerated sesame but began restricting it from the diet based on positive testing performed in the past as part of screening for peanut and tree nut allergies.

With respect to sesame-specific IgE, sensitivity was highest at a lower cutoff value, whereas specificity increased at higher values (see Table 2). A positive ImmunoCAP test showed 71% sensitivity, 31% specificity, 22% PPV, and 80% NPV. The NPV increased up to a threshold of 1 kU_A/L. A sesame-specific IgE level ≥ 7 kU_A/L indicated specificity of $> 90\%$. ROC curve analysis for sesame-specific IgE revealed an area under the curve (AUC) of 0.56 (see Fig. 1).

For varying SPT cutoffs, sensitivity was highest at a lower cutoff value and specificity increased at higher values (see Table 3). A positive SPT showed 71% sensitivity, 58% specificity, 31% PPV, and 88% NPV. A SPT wheal size ≥ 6 mm showed specificity of $> 90\%$. ROC curve analysis for SPT wheal size revealed an AUC of 0.67 (see Fig. 1).

DISCUSSION

The prevalence of sesame allergy varies geographically with increasing prevalence in regions with greatest exposure. Sesame is a common food allergen in countries such as Israel, Japan, and Europe, where it is

Patient	ImmunoCAP Result (kU _A /L)	SPT Wheal (mm)	Reason for Challenge	Clinical Reaction to Challenge	Amount Ingested before Reaction	Medication Given
1	0.61	5	Never ingested, PN positive testing, PN and TN allergic	Hives on arm	100 mg	Diphenhydramine
2	1.85	0	Never ingested, PN positive testing, PN and TN allergic	Emesis	7 g	None
3	<0.35	0	Previously ingested, positive SPT in past, PN and TN allergic	Cough, itchiness of skin	9 g	Diphenhydramine
4	<0.35	3	Previously ingested, positive testing, PN and TN allergic	Refusal to eat	1.5 g	None
5	1.17	7	Never ingested, positive testing, PN and TN allergic	Multiple hives 50 min after completion	11.6 g	None
6	3.33	3	Previously ingested, positive testing, PN and TN allergic	Rhinitis, throat itchiness, emesis, hives, hypotension	100 mg	Epinephrine, diphenhydramine, ranitidine, methylprednisolone, IVF
7	19.9	12	Previously ingested, positive testing, PN allergic	Hives, wheezing, emesis	500 mg	Epinephrine, diphenhydramine

SPT = skin-prick test; PN = peanut; TN = tree nut; IVF = intravenous fluids.

Table 2 Performance characteristics of sesame ImmunoCAP testing at various cutoff points

Cutoff (kU _A /L)	No. (%) At or Exceeding Cutoff	No. (%) Children Failing Challenge and Exceeding Cutoff	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Positive Predictive Value (%)	Negative Predictive Value (%)
<0.35	33 (100%)	7 (100%)	100	0	21.1	—
≥0.35	23 (70%)	5 (71%)	71.4	30.8	21.7	80.0
≥0.7	18 (55%)	4 (57%)	57.1	46.2	22.2	80.0
≥1.0	16 (21%)	4 (57%)	57.1	53.8	25.0	82.4
≥1.5	12 (36%)	3 (43%)	42.9	65.4	25.0	81.0
≥3.0	6 (18%)	2 (29%)	28.6	84.6	33.3	81.5
≥3.5	5 (15%)	1 (14%)	14.3	84.6	20.0	78.6
≥7.0	2 (6%)	1 (14%)	14.3	96.2	50.0	80.6
≥17.5	1 (3%)	1 (14%)	14.3	100	100	81.8




Figure 1. Comparison of receiver operator characteristic curves for sesame-specific IgE and skin-prick tests (SPTs) and its area under the curve. These curves represent the probability of failing oral sesame challenge at a given value for sesame-specific IgE and SPT ($n = 33$ oral sesame challenges).

regularly consumed in the diet. It is becoming more common in the American diet because of immigration and globalization and, consequently, has become an emerging cause of severe allergy in the United States.

We know that direct exposure to sesame causes sensitization but it has been hypothesized that there may also be cross-reactivity between peanut and sesame allergies. Ho *et al.* reported a high rate of sesame sensitization (27.5%) in persistent peanut-allergic children despite complete restriction of sesame from the diet, suggesting antigenic cross-reactivity.¹² A proposed mechanism cited for this cross-reactivity includes homology among the seed storage proteins and oleosins.² Major allergenic seed storage proteins described for sesame seed are Ses i 1, Ses i 2, and Ses i 3.¹³ Oleosins (Ses i 4 and Ses i 5) are oil body proteins and have recently been described as major allergens in sesame, hazelnuts, and peanuts.^{2,13} Given this concern for cross-reactivity between peanuts and sesame, many allergists are screening peanut-allergic children for sesame allergy by specific IgE level and/or SPT. As a result, there are more sesame-sensitized children than ever before. However, it remains unclear whether sesame sensitization implies clinical reactivity.

The aim of this study was to elucidate the predictive relationship of sesame-specific IgE and SPT results to sesame challenge outcomes. Although we did not find a diagnostic decision point for sesame SPT, there was a trend for more predictability with SPT compared with sesame-specific IgE (see Figs. 2, A and B). The SPT AUC was higher than for sesame-specific IgE although not significant. It is noteworthy that 69% of children passing the sesame oral food challenge exhibited a positive ImmunoCAP test; 39% of these children had a level of >2.0 kU_A/L.

Table 3 Performance characteristics of sesame skin-prick testing at various cutoff points

Cutoff Wheal (mm)	No. (%) At or Exceeding Cutoff	No. (%) Children Failing Challenge and Exceeding Cutoff	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Positive Predictive Value (%)	Negative Predictive Value (%)
<3	33 (100%)	7 (100%)	100	0	21.1	—
≥3	16 (48%)	5 (71%)	71.4	57.7	31.3	88.2
≥4	10 (30%)	3 (43%)	42.9	73.1	30.0	82.6
≥5	9 (27%)	3 (43%)	42.9	76.9	33.3	83.3
≥6	4 (12%)	2 (29%)	28.6	92.3	50.0	82.8
≥7	3 (9%)	2 (29%)	28.6	96.2	66.7	83.3
≥12	1 (3%)	1 (14%)	14.3	100	100	81.3




Figure 2. (A) Estimated probability curve for failing oral sesame challenge at a given sesame-specific IgE antibody level derived from logistic regression ($n = 33$ oral sesame challenges). Dashed lines indicate 95% prediction limits. (B) Estimated probability curve for failing oral sesame challenge at a given skin-prick test (SPT) wheal size derived from logistic regression ($n = 33$ oral sesame challenges). Dashed lines indicate 95% prediction limits. Note: There are multiple overlapping open circles depicted in Figs. 1 and 2.

The performance characteristics of both diagnostic tests at several decision points revealed poor sensitivities and PPVs, indicating a low likelihood of disease in those with levels greater than the decision points. Both ImmunoCAP testing and SPT revealed high specificities at a cutoff of ≥ 7 kU_A/L and ≥ 6 mm, respectively, confirming that the tests perform well in those without sesame allergy. Notably, 29% of sesame-allergic patients had a sesame-specific IgE of <0.35 kU_A/L. This is in contrast to the findings of Zavalkoff *et al.* who reported a cutoff of <0.35 kU_A/L as being useful in excluding a diagnosis of sesame allergy.⁸ A SPT wheal size of <3 mm approached an NPV of 90%. Therefore, patients with a negative SPT are likely to have no clinical reactivity with the ingestion of sesame.

A potential limitation of this study is that the majority of food challenges were conducted in patients found to be positive on a sesame screen and in those with a negative ImmunoCAP and/or SPT result despite a convincing history, which could account for the low rate of positive food challenges. A large number of these patients ($n = 24$) were suspected of having sesame allergy based on a positive sesame ImmunoCAP test and/or SPT performed as a screen in those with peanut and tree nut allergies. However, this subset of patients can help elucidate whether sesame sensitization predicts clinical reactivity based on food challenge outcome. It is quite interesting that all seven failed food challenges were patients screened for sesame allergy as a result of having peanut and tree nut allergies; four patients had previously tolerated sesame but were asked to restrict sesame from their diet based on positive results. The remaining nine patients who did have a prior clinical reaction to sesame passed the food challenge.

Another limitation of this study, as well as others,^{8,9} is that sesame allergy was determined by history rather than by the gold standard food challenge, which could introduce recall and reporting bias. Given that this retrospective study was based on a pediatric population, performing food challenges as a diagnostic measure could be considered impractical and unethical. Furthermore, Ho *et al.* used a 20-g total sesame dose for food challenges while our maximal sesame dose was 11.6 g in those >3 years old.¹⁰ There may be a higher sesame ingestion threshold for which clinical reactions occur but, practically, it would be difficult to have children ingest such large quantities of sesame.

Although our study is limited by a small sample of cases, there is an inclination for predicting the outcome of a sesame food challenge with SPT based on our results. Until larger studies are performed, clinicians should consider challenging patients to sesame regardless of sesame-specific IgE or SPT values, unless there is a compelling history of an allergic reaction to sesame. In cases where sesame is clearly tolerated, neither ImmunoCAP testing nor an SPT should be obtained given the potential for false positives and unnecessary food restriction. It is also uncertain whether restricting foods from the diet could lead to a decrease in tolerance to that food as is exemplified by patient 3 in Table 1. Moreover, a negative ImmunoCAP test should be interpreted in the context of history and SPT.

To our knowledge, this study represents the largest number of sesame food challenges performed to evaluate the diagnostic value of both sesame-specific IgE and SPT. Cohen *et al.* found no relationship between sesame-specific IgE, SPT, and oral food challenge outcome in 22 children.² There are studies with larger

numbers of oral challenges examining either sesame-specific IgE or SPT, however. For instance, Ho *et al.* examined the diagnostic accuracy of sesame SPT in 60 children with sesame allergy and identified a wheal diameter ≥ 8 mm as being predictive of a positive food challenge with >95% accuracy.¹⁰

Our results confirm that a positive sesame-specific ImmunoCAP test and positive sesame SPT are not good predictors of true sesame allergy as determined by the gold standard test of an oral sesame challenge. We were unable to establish a threshold with a 95% PPV for both sesame-specific IgE and SPT. ROC curve analysis revealed poor AUC values for both diagnostic testing modalities. Our data add to previous results from other studies and further confirm variation among studies. At this time, caution should be taken in applying these results to patient populations.

REFERENCES

1. Zuidmeer L, Goldhahn K, Rona RJ, et al. The prevalence of plant food allergies: A systematic review. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 121:1210–1218 e4, 2008.
2. Cohen A, Goldberg M, Levy B, et al. Sesame food allergy and sensitization in children: The natural history and long-term follow-up. *Pediatr Allergy Immunol* 18:217–223, 2007.
3. Aaronov D, Tasher D, Levine A, et al. Natural history of food allergy in infants and children in Israel. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 101:637–640, 2008.
4. Dalal I, Binson I, Levine A, et al. The pattern of sesame sensitivity among infants and children. *Pediatr Allergy Immunol* 14:312–316, 2003.
5. Cox L, Williams B, Sicherer S, et al. Pearls and pitfalls of allergy diagnostic testing: report from the American College of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology/American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology Specific IgE Test Task Force. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 101:580–592, 2008.
6. Sampson HA, and Ho DG. Relationship between food-specific IgE concentrations and the risk of positive food challenges in children and adolescents. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 100:444–451, 1997.
7. Sampson HA. Utility of food-specific IgE concentrations in predicting symptomatic food allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 107:891–896, 2001.
8. Zavalkoff S, Kagan R, Joseph L, et al. The value of sesame-specific IgE levels in predicting sesame allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 121:1508–1510, 2008.
9. Maloney JM, Rudengren M, Ahlstedt S, et al. The use of serum-specific IgE measurements for the diagnosis of peanut, tree nut, and seed allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 122:145–151, 2008.
10. Ho MH, Heine RG, Wong W, and Hill DJ. Diagnostic accuracy of skin prick testing in children with tree nut allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 117:1506–1508, 2006.
11. Bernstein IL, Li JT, Bernstein DI, et al. Allergy diagnostic testing: An updated practice parameter. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 100(suppl 3):S1–S148, 2008.
12. Ho MH, Wong WH, Heine RG, et al. Early clinical predictors of remission of peanut allergy in children. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 121:731–736, 2008.
13. Leduc V, Moneret-Vautrin DA, Tzen JT, et al. Identification of oleosins as major allergens in sesame seed allergic patients. *Allergy* 61:349–356, 2006. □

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.