

Accepted Manuscript

Allergenic potential of novel proteins – What can we learn from animal production?

Ricardo D. Ekmay, Craig N. Coon, Gregory S. Ladics, Rod A. Herman

PII: S0273-2300(17)30220-9

DOI: [10.1016/j.yrtph.2017.07.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2017.07.024)

Reference: YRTPH 3886

To appear in: *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*

Received Date: 20 March 2017

Revised Date: 21 July 2017

Accepted Date: 23 July 2017

Please cite this article as: Ekmay, R.D., Coon, C.N., Ladics, G.S., Herman, R.A., Allergenic potential of novel proteins – What can we learn from animal production?, *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology* (2017), doi: 10.1016/j.yrtph.2017.07.024.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



Allergenic potential of novel proteins – What can we learn from animal production?

*Ricardo D. Ekmay*¹, Craig N. Coon², Gregory S. Ladics³, and Rod A. Herman¹*

¹*Dow AgroSciences LLC, Indianapolis, Indiana*

²*University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas*

³*DuPont Co., Haskell Laboratory, Newark, Delaware*

**Corresponding Author:*

Dow AgroSciences LLC

9330 Zionsville Rd.

Indianapolis, Indiana 46268

rdekmay@dow.com

(317) 337-5190

Allergenic potential of novel proteins – What can we learn from animal production?

Abstract

Currently, risk assessment of the allergenic potential of novel proteins relies heavily on evaluating protein digestibility under normal conditions based on the theory that allergens are more resistant to gastrointestinal digestion than non-allergens. There is also proposed guidance for expanded in vitro digestibility assay conditions to include vulnerable sub-populations. One of the underlying rationales for the expanded guidance is that current in vitro assays do not accurately replicate the range of physiological conditions. Animal scientists have long sought to predict protein and amino acid digestibility for precision nutrition. Monogastric production animals, especially swine, have gastrointestinal systems similar to humans, and evaluating potential allergen digestibility in this context may be beneficial. Currently, there is no compelling evidence that the mechanisms sometimes postulated to be associated with allergenic sensitization, e.g. antacid modification of stomach pH, are valid among production animals. Furthermore, examples are provided where non-biologically representative assays are better at predicting protein and amino acid digestibility compared with those designed to mimic in vivo conditions. Greater emphasis should be made to align in vitro assessments with in vivo data.

Keywords: Allergenicity, Novel proteins, In vitro assays, Animal nutrition, Risk assessment

1. Introduction

In what is considered a seminal study, Astwood et al. (1996) reported that allergenic proteins were more resistant to proteolytic digestion than non-allergenic proteins. Since then, resistance to digestion in the gastrointestinal (GI) tract has been considered a common property of food allergens. However, when additional allergens and non-allergens were selected controlling for protein structural family, resistance to digestion was not a differentiator (Fu et al., 2002, Herman et al., 2006a, 2007, Schnell and Herman, 2009, Bøgh and Madsen, 2016). Furthermore, some proteins that are considered to be allergenic have been shown to be readily degraded by the GI tract, and rapidly degraded in pepsin assays, e.g. Ara h 3 in peanuts (van Bostel et al., 2008). Sensitization can, therefore, occur by routes other than post-gastric, as is observed in oral allergy syndrome. Thus, serious doubt has been cast as to whether resistance to digestion is sufficient to differentiate between an allergenic protein and a non-allergenic protein.

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has recently proposed expanded guidance for the generation of in vitro data to aid in the risk assessment of novel genetically modified proteins for allergenicity (EFSA, 2016). Briefly, it is proposed that a two-step in vitro digestion assay be used to determine the extent of protein digestion. A range of conditions is recommended to reflect the range of gastrointestinal conditions found in the human population, including weakened digestive function. The FAO/WHO decision tree, however, advocates for assessment of comparative resistance to pepsin alone with the understanding that human digestion is highly variable and the assay is not a perfect indicator of allergenicity (Taylor, 2002). EFSA's review of the literature regarding in vitro protein digestion assays, although extensive, would benefit from expanding the scope of in vitro digestibility work that is assessed. If assessment of *resistance* of proteins to digestion is critical, then it would be worthwhile to review the literature for *susceptibility* of proteins to digestion, vis a vis, nutrient availability in animal nutrition. There have been extensive efforts over the last several decades to accurately predict protein and amino acid digestibility, and other metrics of protein availability, for animal production nutrition (Stein et al., 2007). The main advantage of reviewing the literature from an animal production perspective is the wealth of in vivo protein and amino acid digestibility data available across several different feedstuffs. Swine have long been used as models for the human gastrointestinal tract and are sensitive to many of the same allergens as humans (Rupa et al., 2009).

It is from this perspective that we add to the discourse regarding two underpinnings of the allergenicity guidance. Namely, (1) alteration of protein digestibility by external modifiers and (2), in vitro assays as a predictor of in vivo digestibility.

2.1 Alterations to gastric pH and protein digestibility

The pH of the gastric phase has received much attention in relation to food allergy since it is believed that impaired digestion may result in the stability of allergenic proteins and in sensitization (Astwood et al., 1996). Researchers point to an increased incidence of food allergies among users of antacid medications and theorize that such medications increase gastric pH and therefore impair the ability of pepsin to digest allergenic proteins (Untersmayr and Jensen-Jaroli, 2008, Pali-Schöll and Jensen-Jarolim, 2011).

Gastric pH is indeed low, with fasting pH being <3 and <1 among some individuals. Yet, pH increases dramatically during a meal, with gastric pH rising to $3 < \text{pH} < 5$ (Clark et al., 1993, Gardner et al., 2001, Kong and Singh, 2008). This is also true in swine (Chiang et al., 2008). This increase in gastric pH is partially due to the

buffering capacity of the meal, and therefore, the extent of the pH rise is dependent on the matrix components of the meal. This pH rise is necessary to continue acid secretion and pepsinogen production from parietal cells and prevent negative feedback (Di Mario and Goni, 2014). The gastric pH begins to drop as the food bolus begins to move into the small intestine and returns to its fasting pH during gastric emptying. The return to a low pH then indicates that gastric acid secretion can cease. Thus, when food is present, pepsin is functioning under sub-optimal pH. This is not to understate the importance of low pH to the denaturation of proteins and activation of pepsin (Herman et al., 2006b). While the optimal pH for pepsin is often believed to be 2.0, the optimal pH for digestion actually differs depending on what substrate is being digested, the source organism from which the pepsin was collected (Piper and Fenton, 1965, Tanaka and Yada, 1996, Yoshimasu et al., 2002), the individual from which it was collected, and even the condition within an individual (Roberts 2006). Furthermore, the peptides produced by digestions using porcine and human pepsin can differ (Ulleberg et al. 2011). Thus, the effects of pH on the human digestion of any given protein using porcine pepsin as a surrogate for human pepsin (as is common in in vitro assays) may not, even qualitatively, mimic the situation in humans.

The active ingredient in most popular over the counter antacids is calcium carbonate, and calcium carbonate is also one of the most used calcium sources for production animals. Elevated calcium intake among production animals may be similar to human intake of acid neutralizing products. Recent evidence in swine has indicated that high calcium intake depresses growth (González-Vega et al., 2016, Merriman et al., 2016). It has been known for some time that acid-base balance affects growth performance. Such growth depression may be mediated through depressed nutrient digestion and availability arising from elevated gastric pH. However, Merriman et al. (2016) indicates that feed efficiency (and, therefore, nutrient availability) was not impacted. Instead feed intake was depressed with high (~2x observed requirement) calcium intake. González-Vega et al., 2016 observed reductions in feed efficiency, but only when phosphorus intake was low. When phosphorus intake was increased (another critical buffer), no difference in feed efficiency was observed. Patience et al. (1986) fed increasing amounts of sodium bicarbonate or potassium bicarbonate and observed no alteration to nitrogen, lysine, or tryptophan digestibility. Thus, evidence suggests that nutrient availability remains the same.

Weanling pigs often suffer from allergic reactions and growth depression when soybean is fed (Coffey et al., 2000). These symptoms are mitigated as the pig ages, thus, sensitivity is believed to arise due to the immature

gut of the weanling pig. Given that the gastric pH of a weanling pig is often >5, it is certainly plausible that a high pH is limiting enzymatic activity. However, the predominant protease during weaning is not pepsin, but rather chymosin, an enzyme that plays a critical role in milk clotting (Rezaei et al., 2013). It is not until the ~5th week of age that pepsin becomes the predominant protease. Thus, one might ask: even if pH were lowered, would there be additional protein degradation? Would any version of a pepsin assay have accurately segregated digestible and indigestible proteins in the weanling pig? The results of administering acidifiers in animal production would appear to indicate that the hypothesis that pH is the main driver may hold merit. The primary aim of acidifiers is to reduce gastric pH and allow pepsin to operate in a more favorable environment, thus improving protein digestion. The use of acidifiers does indeed improve protein availability and growth performance. However, the results of a meta-analysis have indicated that there is no alteration to gastric pH in swine when an acidifier is fed, including in weanling pigs (Tung and Pettigrew, 2006, Kil et al., 2011, Suiryanrayna and Ramana, 2015). These observations indicate that pepsin is likely no more active when an acidifier is fed than when it is omitted, and a mechanism other than increased enzyme efficacy is at play, e.g. reduced pathogen load in an acidic environment.

Currently, the pathway to allergenicity proposed by some researchers is not fully supported by observations in similar scenarios in animal production. Both immature and mature pigs appear to be quite resistant to pH changes due to external acid modifiers, and there is no clear linkage between their intake and reduced digestive capacity. Even among dyspeptic human individuals, it does not appear likely that enzyme efficacy is impaired through changes to gastric pH. However, inherently reduced digestive capacity, as in weanling pigs, may predispose animals to sensitization, and this is likely a more critical contributor to allergen susceptibility. Under this scenario, examination of pH in in vitro models may prove fruitless as predictors of determining the allergenic potential of novel proteins.

2.2 *In vitro models of protein and amino acid digestibility in production animals*

A number of factors may affect protein digestibility in the gastrointestinal tract and these may be of importance when designing an in vitro model (Swaigood and Catignani, 2001). Fiber, by forming complexes with or surrounding proteins, or by influencing gut transit time, may impact the extent of protein digestion. Likewise, fiber may also increase secretion of mucin, and thereby increase the endogenous loss of amino acids from the intestinal tract (Mathai et al., 2016). The presence of other matrix components may also stimulate/depress the

production of other gastrointestinal enzymes that breakdown elements preventing action by proteolytic enzymes. Anti-nutritive factors such as phytate and tannins may bind proteins and amino acids and prevent their availability; others such as trypsin inhibitor prevent action by proteolytic enzymes. Processing factors such as cooking also affect protein digestion. Ultimately, the net total of all these effects dictates the extent of protein hydrolysis. To replicate the net total in vitro, we either need to include all factors (which may not be possible or feasible), or adjust a few factors so that in vitro digestion aligns with the physiologically observed net digestion. In other words, rather than adding additional factors to the model, the enzyme concentration of a simple one or two enzyme model may be adjusted to align with in vivo digestion. The inability to pinpoint the exact conditions necessary to accurately predict in vivo digestibility is likely due to the fact that in vivo enzyme concentrations and efficacy are directly tied to meal composition and quantity, as well as other stimuli. It would also suffice to say that no single assay is sufficiently robust to be used across different feedstuffs.

It has been pointed out that current efforts to mimic gastric conditions are not always physiologically relevant and do not take into account susceptible populations, e.g. infants or adults with impaired digestive functions, and that assay conditions must be run at several conditions, namely variable pH, to account for these populations (Moreno, 2006, EFSA, 2016). Such an opinion does not take into account that in many cases, a “non-physiological” representation may be required to replicate in vivo observations (as determined by standard ileal digestibility, regression analysis technique, or growth assay). In one example, the in vitro protein and amino acid digestibility of animal protein meals was found to better correlate with in vivo digestibility when the concentrations of pepsin in a standard pepsin assay was reduced to 0.002% from 0.2% (Johnston and Coon, 1979, Parsons, 1997, Bellaver et al., 2000). If one were to alter pH in a standard pepsin assay, the ultimate result would be a reduction in pepsin action. Yet, in the example of animal proteins, reducing the concentration of pepsin in an assay by several orders of magnitude can be more representative of “normal” digestibility. Non-physiological in vitro conditions may also be better at predicting digestibility of other nutrients as well, e.g. digestible energy (Hans Stein, University of Illinois, personal communication).

Although in vitro assays containing multiple enzymes are generally better at predicting digestibility (Ravindran and Bryden, 1999), this is not always true, and many in vitro assays that have been developed to mimic physiological conditions have not necessarily provided greater accuracy in predicting in vivo protein digestibility as

compared with simpler assays. Rochell et al. (2013) compared the correlation of two *in vitro* assays, a pepsin assay (at 0.2%) and an immobilized digestive enzyme (IDEA) assay, with chick standard ileal amino acid digestibility (SIAAD) for various animal proteins. The IDEA assay is an immobilized enzyme assay that includes a gastric phase with pepsin and an intestinal phase with pancreatin, which is conceptually similar to USP dissolution testing. Results of the study indicated that the correlation between the pepsin assay and SIAAD was greater than the correlation between PC-IDEA and SIAAD. A trial report summary by Novus International, Inc. (2012) regarding the use of IDEA across several plant and animal proteins indicated that “the accuracy of the predicted values were insufficient for use in nutritional models” despite generally high correlations.

Even if correlations were high, they may mask the lack of accuracy of an *in vitro* model if not validated against *in vivo* values. Graham et al. (1986) reported that an *in vitro* assay had generally good correlations between *in vitro* and *in vivo* protein solubilities ($r^2=0.78$) of various feedstuffs, but that *in vitro* solubilities were on average 21 percentage points greater than *in vivo* protein solubilities. Similar observations reported from other studies (Schasteen et al., 2007, Cho and Kim, 2011). Results of a study by Qiao et al. (2004) indicated that an *in vitro* assay mimicking USP dissolution testing significantly over-predicted the number of peptides (>1 kDa) left undigested compared with an *in vivo* digestibility study. This is a critical finding given the proposed 9 amino acid (~1 kDa) cutoff for allergenic potential by EFSA. Significant differences between the predicted *in vitro* amino acid digestibilities of several critical amino acids and *in vivo* ileal determined values were observed. Accuracy issues can be overcome and prediction equations generated, but only if appropriate *in vivo* data are available (Queiroz Mendes et al., 2016).

3. Conclusion

Impaired protein digestibility may play a role in food allergenicity. However, it should be understood that current *in vitro* models do not offer sufficient accuracy to discriminate to the level of detail desired by EFSA; and this is further complicated by a lack of consensus on digestibility as a predictor of allergenicity. Butts et al. (2012) reviewed current *in vitro* models of protein and amino acid digestibility and concluded that *in vitro* models are most useful at *ranking* food proteins according to their protein digestibility. Furthermore, Minekus et al. (2014) states that “An accurate prediction of the *in vivo* bio-accessibility (availability for absorption through the gut wall) is

limited...*Ranking* [emphasis added] of the digestion of different products is more feasible...” Indeed, that is the familiar role of in vitro models among animal nutritionists.

Conflict of interest statement

R.D.E. and R.A.H are employed by Dow AgroSciences LLC, a company that develops and markets transgenic crops. G.S.L and C.N.N. have no disclosures to report.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Hans Stein (University of Illinois) and Gary Cromwell (University of Kentucky) for their thoughtful comments on this manuscript.

References

- Anonymous. 2012. Estimating the digestibility of protein and amino acids. Novus International, Inc. Available at: http://www.novusint.com/Portals/0/NovusDocuments/LIT2907_v3_EN_GLOBAL.pdf
- Bøgh, K. L. and C. B. Madsen. 2016. Food allergens: is there a correlation between stability to digestion and allergenicity? *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition* 56:1545-1567.
- Chiang, C. C., J. Croom, S. T. Chuang, P. W. S. Chiou, and B. Yu. 2008. Development of a Dynamic System Simulating Pig Gastric Digestion. *Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci.* 21: 1522-1528.
- Cho, J. H., and I. H. Kim. 2011. Evaluation of the Apparent Ileal Digestibility (AID) of Protein and Amino Acids in Nursery Diets by *In vitro* and *In vivo* Methods. *Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci.* 24: 1007-1010.
- Clark, G. W. B., J. R. Jamieson, R. A. Hinder, P. V. Polishuk, T. R. Demeester, N. Gupta, and S. C. Cheng. 1993. The relationship between gastric pH and the emptying of solid, semisolid and liquid meals. *J. Gastrintest. Mot.* 5: 273-279.
- Coffey, R. D., G. R. Parker, and K. M. Laurent. 2000. Feeding and managing the weanling pig. University of Kentucky. Lexington and Kentucky State University; Frankfort. KY. Cooperative Extension Service, ASC-149.

- 212 Di Mario, F., and E. Goni. 2014. Gastric acid secretion Changes during a century. *Best Practice and*
213 *Research Clinical Gastroenterology*. 28: 953-965.
- 214 EFSA. 2016. Draft guidance on allergenicity assessment of genetically modified plants. EFSA Journal.
215 doi:10.2903/j.efsa.20YY.NNNN.
- 216 Engle, M. J. 1994. The role of soybean meal hypersensitivity in postweaning lag and diarrhea in piglets. *J*
217 *Swine Health Prod.* 2(4):7-10
- 218 Fu, T.-J., U. R. Abbott, and C. Hatzos. 2002. Digestibility of food allergens and nonallergenic proteins in
219 simulated gastric fluid and simulated intestinal fluid: a comparative study. *J. Agric Food Chem.* 50:7154-
220 7160
- 221 Gardner, J. D., Ciociola, A. A., and M. Robinson. 2002. Measurement of meal-stimulated gastric acid
222 secretion by in vivo gastric autotitration. *J. Appl. Physiol.* 92: 427-434.
- 223 González-Vega, J. C., C. L. Walk, and H. H. Stein. 2016. Digestible calcium requirements for 25 to 50 kg
224 pigs.. *J. Anim. Sci.* 94:104. doi:10.2527/msasas2016-220
- 225 Graham, H., W. Löwgren, and P. Åman. 1989. An in vitro method for studying digestion in the pig 2.
226 Comparison with in vivo ileal and faecal digestibilities. *Br. J. Nutr.* 61: 689-698.
- 227 Herman, R. A., N. P. Storer, and Y. Gao. 2006a. Digestion Assays in Allergenicity Assessment of
228 Transgenic Proteins. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 114: 1154-1157.
- 229 Herman, R.A., Storer, N.P., Gao, Y. 2006b. Acid-induced unfolding kinetics in simulated gastric
230 digestion of proteins. *Reg. Toxicol. Pharmacol.* 46: 93-99.
- 231 Herman, R.A., M. M. Woolhiser, G. S. Ladics, V. A. Korjagin, B. W. Schafer, N. P. Storer, S. B. Green,
232 and L. Kan. 2007. Stability of a set of allergens and non-allergens in simulated gastric fluid. *Int. J. Food*
233 *Sci. Nutr.* 58: 125-141.

- 234 Johnston, J., and C. N. Coon, 1979. The use of varying levels of pepsin for pepsin digestion studies with
235 animal proteins. *Poult. Sci.* 58:1271–1273.
- 236 Kil, D. Y., W. B. Kwon, and B. G. Kim. 2011. Dietary acidifiers in weanling pig diets: a review. *Rev*
237 *Colomb Cienc Pec.* 24: 231-247.
- 238 Kong, F., and R. P. Singh. 2008. Disintegration of Solid Foods in Human Stomach. *J. Food Sci.* 73: R67-
239 80.
- 240 Mathai, J. K., J. K. Htoo, J. Thomson, K. J. Touchette, and H. H. Stein. 2016. Effects of dietary fiber on
241 the ideal standardized ileal digestible threonine:lysine ratio for 25 to 50 kg growing gilts. *J. Anim. Sci.*
242 94:4217-4230.
- 243 Merriman, L. A., C. L. Walk, C. M. Parsons, and H. H. Stein. 2016. Digestible calcium requirement for
244 100 to 130 kg pigs. *J. Anim. Sci.* 94(E-Suppl. 5):458.
- 245 Minekus, M., M. Alminger, P. Alvito, S. Ballance, T. Bohn, C. Bourlieu, F. Carrière, R. Boutrou, M.
246 Corredig, D. Dupont, C. Dufour, L. Egger, M. Golding, S. Karakaya, B. Kirkhus, S. Le Feunteun, U.
247 Lesmes, A. Macierzanka, A. Mackie, S. Marze, D. J. McClements, O. Ménard, I. Recio, C. N Santos, R.
248 P. Singh, G. E. Vegarud, M. S. Wickham, W. Weitschies, and A. Brodkorb. 2014. A standardised static in
249 vitro digestion method suitable for food - an international consensus. *Food Funct.* 5:1113-24
- 250 Pali-Schöll, I., and E. Jensen-Jarolim. 2011. Anti-acid medication as a risk factor for food allergy.
251 *Allergy.* 66: 469-477.
- 252 Parsons, C. M., F. Castanon, and Y. Han. 1997. Protein and Amino Acid Quality of Meat and Bone meal.
253 *Poult. Sci.* 76: 361-368.
- 254 Patience, J. F., R. E. Austic, and R. D. Boyd. 1986. The effect of sodium bicarbonate or potassium
255 bicarbonate on acid-base status and protein and energy digestibility in swine. *Nutrition Research.* 6: 263-
256 273.

- 257 Piper, D. W., and B. H. Fenton. 1965. pH stability and activity curves of pepsin with special reference to
258 their clinical importance. *Gut*. 6: 506-508.
- 259 Queiroz Mendes, F., Oliveira, M. G. D, Costa, N. M. B., Pires, C. V., and F. R. Passos. 2016. Capability
260 of on vitro digestibility methods to predict in vivo digestibility of vegetal and animal proteins. *Arch*
261 *Latinoam Nutr.* 66: 5-16.
- 262 Ravindran, V., and W. L. Bryden. 1999. Amino acid availability in poultry – in vitro and in vivo
263 measurements. *Aust. J. Agric. Res.* 50: 889-908.
- 264 Rezaei, R., Wang, W., Wu, Z., Dai, Z., Wang, J., and Wu, G. 2013. Biochemical and physiological bases
265 for utilization of dietary amino acids by young Pigs. *Journal of Animal Science and Biotechnology*, 4(1),
266 7.
- 267 Roberts, N. B. 2006. Review article: human pepsins – their multiplicity, function and role in reflux
268 disease. *Alimentary Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 24:2-9
- 269 Rochell, S. J., D. L. Kuhlers, and W. A. Dozier III. 2013. Relationship between in vitro assays and
270 standardized ileal amino acid digestibility of animal protein meals in broilers. *Poult. Sci.* 92: 158-170.
- 271 Rupa, P., J. Schmied, and B. N. Wilkie. 2009. Porcine allergy and IgE. *Veterinary Immunology and*
272 *Immunopathology*. 132: 41-45.
- 273 Schasteen, C. S., J. Wu, M. G. Schulz, and C. M. Parsons. 2007. Correlation of an immobilized Digestive
274 Enzyme Assay with Poultry True Amino Acid Digestibility for Soybean Meal. *Poult. Sci.* 86: 343-348.
- 275 Schnell, S., and R. A. Herman. 2009. Should digestion assays be used to estimate persistence of potential
276 allergens in tests for safety of novel food proteins? *Clin. Mol. Allergy* 7:1-7.
- 277 Stein, H. H., B. Sève, M. F. Fuller, P. J. Moughan, and C. F. M. de Lange. 2007. Invited review: Amino
278 acid bioavailability and digestibility in pig feed ingredients: Terminology and application. *J. Anim. Sci.*
279 85: 172-180.

- 280 Steingoetter, A., M. Sauter, J. Curcic, D. Liu, M. Fried, M. Fox, and W. Schwizer. 2015. Volume,
281 distribution and acidity of gastric secretion on and off proton pump inhibitor treatment: a randomized
282 double-blind controlled study in patients with gastro-esophageal reflux disease (GERD) and healthy
283 subjects. *BMC Gastroenterology*. 15: 111-122.
- 284 Suiryanrayna, M. V. A. N., and J. V. Ramana. 2015. A review of the effects of dietary organic acids fed
285 to swine. *J. Animal Science and Biotechnology*. 6:45-56.
- 286 Swaisgood H. E. and G. L. Catignani. 2001. Protein digestibility: in vitro methods of assessment. *Adv*
287 *Food Nutr Res*. 35:185-236.
- 288 Tanaka, T. and R. Y. Yada. 1996. Expression of soluble cloned porcine pepsinogen A in *Escherichia coli*.
289 *Biochem J*. 315: 443-446.
- 290 Taylor, S. L. 2002. Protein allergenicity assessment of foods produced through agricultural
291 biotechnology. *Annu. Rev. Pharmacol. Toxicol*. 42: 99-112.
- 292 Tung, C. M. and J. E. Pettigrew. 2006. Critical review of acidifiers. National Pork Board. Available
293 at: <http://www.pork.org/Documents/PorkScience/ReviewOfAcidifiers.pdf>
- 294 Ulleberg, E. K., I. Comi, H. Holm, E. B. Herud, M. Jacobsen, and G. E. Vegarud. 2011. Human
295 Gastrointestinal Juices Intended for Use in In Vitro Digestion Models. *Food Digestion* 2:52-61
- 296 Untersmayr, E., W. J. Beil, A. Riemer, S. Spitzauer, and E. Jensen-Jarolim. 2003. Antacid medication
297 inhibits digestion of dietary proteins and causes food allergy: A fish allergy model in Balb/c mice. *J.*
298 *Allergy Clin. Immunol*. 112: 616-623.
- 299 Untersmayr, E., and E. Jensen-Jarolim. 2008. The role of protein digestibility and antacids on food allergy
300 outcomes. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol*. 121: 1301-1310.
- 301 Yoshimasu, M. A., J. K. Ahn, T. Tanaka., and R. Y. Yada. 2002. Soluble expression and purification of
302 porcine pepsinogen from *Pichia pastoris*. *Protein Expression and Purification*. 25: 229-236.

Highlights

- Risk assessment of allergenicity of novel proteins relies on *in vitro* digestibility
- It is questioned whether *in vitro* digestibility can distinguish allergenic proteins
- Proposed pathways to sensitization are not supported by production animal data
- Physiologically-based assays may not be better at predicting *in vivo* digestibility