



This is a repository copy of *A 17 year experience in perioperative anaphylaxis 1998-2015: harmonising optimal detection of mast cell mediator release.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/107295/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Egner, W. [orcid.org/0000-0002-2654-9881](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2654-9881), Sargur, R., Shrimpton, A. et al. (2 more authors) (2016) A 17 year experience in perioperative anaphylaxis 1998-2015: harmonising optimal detection of mast cell mediator release. *Clinical and Experimental Allergy*, 46. pp. 1465-1473. ISSN 0954-7894

<https://doi.org/10.1111/cea.12785>

---

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: W. Egner et al, *Clinical & Experimental Allergy*, 2016 (46) 1465–1473, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/cea.12785>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

**Reuse**

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

# **A 17 year experience in Perioperative Anaphylaxis 1998-2015: Harmonising optimal detection of Mast Cell mediator release.**

**William Egner, Ravishankar Sargur, Anna Shrimpton, Melanie York and Kevin Green, Clinical Immunology and Allergy Unit and Dept. of Immunology and Protein Reference Unit, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust.**

**Corresponding author: Dr William Egner, Clinical Immunology and Allergy Unit, Northern General Hospital, Road, S5 7AU, Sheffield, England.**

**Acknowledgements:** Dr Egner designed the study, performed the analysis, and authored the paper. Dr Sargur, Dr Shrimpton, Dr York and Mr. Green contributed to the analysis, conclusions and reviewed the text. The database was populated by Linda Baker, Leah Tipple, Ashton Coward, Emma Bloor and Graeme Wild.

**Key words:** Allergy, Human, Mast Cells, Anaesthesia, Perioperative, Anaphylaxis

## **Abbreviations**

NICE National Institute of Clinical Excellence

AAGBI Association of Anaesthetists of Great Britain and Ireland

CV coefficient of variation

CI Confidence interval

T1, T2, T3 and Tp First, second, third and peak tryptase samples

UMH Urinary Methylhistamine

WAO World Allergy Organisation

IQR interquartile range

$\Delta Tp_{20\%}$  positive change in tryptase  $\geq 20\%$  from trough to peak

$\Delta Tp_3$  positive change in tryptase level from trough to peak of  $\geq 3 \mu\text{g/L}$

## **Abstract**

### **Background**

Sheffield NARCOS (National Adverse Reactions Advisory Service) investigates suspected perioperative anaesthetic reactions using serial tryptase, urinary methylhistamine and clinical information. Further recommendations for additional allergy clinic assessment are provided.

### **Objective**

To establish a robustly measurable protocol for identifying mast cell mediator (MMR) release in this cohort. To compare these thresholds with previous suggested thresholds and algorithms.

### **Method**

A review of 3,455 NARCOS cases referred with a suspected peri-operative allergic reaction. Tryptase, Urinary methylhistamine (UMH) and clinical details were analysed. 1746 cases were graded using the Ring and Messmer scale. Reaction grade, tryptase and UMH changes were compared with statistical and graphical presentations appropriate to non-normally distributed measurements using Analyse-IT software.

### **Results**

Sensitive strategies such as  $3\mu\text{g/l}$  or 20% are measurable, translatable and would substantially increase detection of potentially relevant changes in tryptases. Adequate quality assurance for low level measurement is needed.

An incremental threshold of 20% would identify potential MMR in an additional 14% of cases with peak tryptase ( $T_p$ ) between 5 and  $14\mu\text{g/L}$  and a further 15% with  $T_p$  below  $5\mu\text{g/L}$ . Further work is required to establish the diagnostic performance characteristics of this more sensitive approach.

[Type text]

UMH also identified up to 120 further cases of potential MMR in absence of tryptase increments.

### **Conclusion and Clinical Relevance**

Future studies should establish and compare the predictive performance characteristics of each strategy against clinical phenotypes. A single agreed definition of positive serial tryptases is needed to enable robust evaluation of diagnostic strategies. This could serve as a harmonised standard for comparative studies of case series from different centres.

## **Introduction:**

The optimum number of tryptase measurements and the best interpretative strategy have not yet been established in peri-operative anaphylaxis. The predominant diagnostic indicator in allergy diagnosis is the clinical history and most tests are thought to be less reliable. However the tests, and their interpretation, are the most amenable to standardization or harmonization. There have been few large reviews of investigation of perioperative anaphylaxis and the optimal diagnostic test combination remains unknown. The reference diagnosis in those studies is predominantly based on clinical criteria derived from expert opinion and observational studies (WAO International Consensus 201 [1], National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease/Food Allergy and Anaphylaxis Network [2] and AAGBI Guidelines 2009 [3]). However neither clinical criteria, nor a single robust standardised tryptase interpretation protocol have been subjected to extensive clinical evaluation, and it is very difficult to remove mimics of anaphylaxis from the studies. Allergen triggers are only identified in half of the cases in many series [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [10]. We do not know if current presumptions of poor sensitivity of tryptase testing are biased by lack of specificity of the clinical criteria or insensitivity of the tests interpretive criteria.

This causes a particular problem when deriving performance characteristics for diagnostic tests in anaesthetic allergy, since a diagnostic drug challenge is often impractical. There are many mimics of the clinical picture of anaphylaxis, including direct mast cell mediator release and other causes of hypotension and bronchospasm, including the pharmacological action of the drugs themselves. Harmonisation of diagnostic test performance measurement is possible and can serve as a fixed point of reference to enable derivation of translatable performance characteristics. In addition the optimum number of tryptase samples has not been validated, although recently various sampling criteria have been proposed based on clinical opinion and knowledge of tryptase half-life data [11] [12] [13] [14] [15].

We examined the last 3,455 cases in NARCOS, a national service for the laboratory investigation of adverse anaesthetic drug reactions based in Sheffield, England, to evaluate

the performance of serial tryptase and urinary methyl histamine measurement. We compared the results against published criteria for clinical grading of reactions.

## **Methods**

### **Data**

We conducted a retrospective survey of the NARCOS database containing the laboratory and clinical information on all samples referred to Sheffield for NARCOS assessment, including tryptase (T) blood tests or urinary methyl histamine (UMH) tests taken at the time of reaction and 24 hours later. Our required proforma protocol advised serial tryptase measurements immediately, 1-6 hours after reaction and at 24 hours. Most patients had at least 2 serial tryptases (3400), but there was likely to be a wide variation in actual timing, with potential inaccuracies introduced in some during sample labelling, laboratory sample handling and referral onwards. Samples were therefore analysed according to their labelled temporal sequence as T1, T2 or T3.

### **Analysis**

All statistical and graphical analysis was performed using Analyse-IT software V4.0 (Analyse-IT software ltd, Leeds, UK). Pearson's, Spearman's and Kendal's Tau were used for analysis of correlation of Tryptase with grade; Wilcoxon Median Differences for differences in the medians. Median and 95% confidence intervals are plotted because the data is not normally distributed. Analyte measurements, incremental changes and distributions were compared with reaction grade and the number of patients in each cohort who exceeded each threshold incremental changes from peak to trough were tabulated as detailed below. Performance of the threshold incremental strategies in those patients with peak tryptase above and below the "reference range" for both 11.4 (95<sup>th</sup> centile) and 14µg/L (99<sup>th</sup> centile) cut-off levels were compared.

## Quality Control

Local tryptase assay validation data (ImmunoCAP, Sweden Diagnostics) demonstrated a coefficient of variation (CV) of 10% or less across the measurable range to 3.5µg/L (CV=5%). Therefore a change of tryptase value  $\geq 20\%$  can be determined to be the 95% confidence interval for a real and measurable change in this assay; this was the minimum value used to determine a true change in tryptase between samples. For values of less than 3µg/L a very rigorous threshold of a 100% increase was used (a 2-fold change) for comparison, to avoid over-interpretation of changes at low levels. The 3µg/L threshold has a very similar effect to the (1.2xbaseline plus 2µg/L) threshold used in some studies. The upper limit of normal of 14µg/ml was validated locally as our 99<sup>th</sup> centile reference range (consistent with the manufacturer's data which quotes the 95<sup>th</sup> centile as 11.4µg/L). Utilising a simple incremental threshold of 3µg/L conveniently represents a 300% increase at 1 µg/L, a 100% increase at 3µg/L, a 60% increment at 5 µg/L, a 26% increment at 11.4 and a 21% increment at 14 µg/L. It also has the benefit of simplicity.

Throughout the study a single tryptase method (UniCAP, Thermo Scientific, Uppsala, Sweden) and single UMH assay (Pharmacia, Uppsala, Sweden) was used. Tryptase assays performed well in Internal quality control and external quality assurance (UK NEQAS Tryptase) and the between laboratory CV for all available analyser groups in the scheme are comparable and under 10% worldwide.

The urinary methyl histamine assay was validated in house and has a CV of <20% with a locally verified reference range cut-off.

Creatinine-corrected values were reported and positive results defined as greater than 25 µg /mmol creatinine (the 95<sup>th</sup> centile of normal urines locally validated). Creatinine assays were subjected to satisfactory UK NEQAS assessment throughout, but no EQA currently exists for UMH.

The confounding variable of sample mislabeling in sequence or timing, or variability in individual tryptase kinetics is compensated for by utilising peak to trough changes ( $\Delta T_p$ ).

[Type text]

[Type text]



## Results

### Case mix and sampling

3455 cases were referred between January 1998 and May 2015 (1271 males and 2184 females). Twice as many females were referred. 12 cases were excluded because the laboratory failed to send the accompanying samples. 43 cases had single tryptase measurement and were excluded; of which 33% were  $\geq 14\mu\text{g/L}$  and 40%  $\geq 11.4\mu\text{g/L}$ .

Only 7 / 3455 (0.2 %) of the procedures were reported to have been abandoned. 41/ 3455 (1.2 %) deaths were noted (many post-operative), but definitive outcomes are not yet known for the whole cohort.

### Tryptase Sampling and levels

3400 cases had 2 or more tryptase samples (98%); 71 % (2410) had a 3 tryptase series. 29% (990) had only two tryptases performed.

The first tryptase was raised in most cases, but the median peak values are relatively low, with only 232 being  $>100$  and 88/232  $> 200\mu\text{g/L}$  (2%).

1395/3400 (41% of the referred samples) had had a peak tryptase ( $T_p$ )  $\geq 14\mu\text{g/L}$  and 45.6% were  $>11.4\mu\text{g/L}$  on any one of the three samples (Table 1 & 2). The first raised tryptase was usually the first sample (T1): 1312 had a raised T1; 92 had a normal T1 but raised second sample (T2) and 8 (0.5%) had a normal T1 and T2 but a raised T3. Tryptase results are not normally distributed in any reaction class. Median peak (highest) tryptase in the positive cohort was  $39.5\mu\text{g/L}$  (IQR 22.6-39.5). Median tryptase in all raised T1 samples was  $35.5\mu\text{g/L}$ . Ratios of trough to peak tryptase ranged from 0 to 8400% increase.

Increments fail to identify the 21 (0.6%) cases where tryptase is  $>200\mu\text{g/L}$  (above the measuring range of the assay) throughout T1, T2 and T3 samples (i.e. not exceeding a  $3\mu\text{g/L}$  or 20% change), and those where the tryptase drops less than 20% in the series. (Table 1-3). 20% changes were less sensitive than  $3\mu\text{g/L}$  in raised peak tryptases. Initial

single tryptase measurements can be misleading, as a few are initially very low (<5) and give no clues to the subsequent rise.

### **Reaction Severity**

2053 (60%) of referrals provided clinical information: 1746 referrals had sufficient clinical information to grade the reaction according to the Ring and Messmer scale a further 307 specified anaphylaxis, but without sufficient details to confidently grade.

230 (13%) of 1746 requests were grade 1 reactions: 259 (15%) were grade 2; 33% (575) were grade 3; 37% (641) were grade 4 reactions, of whom 217 (12%) presented solely with hypotension. 41 fatal Grade 5 cases (2.4%) were declared (Figure 1).

A single known mastocytosis case was identified at referral, with a clear additional acute change in tryptase levels.

In the absence of any change in referral patterns we can therefore assume that >70% of the entire cohort of referrals would be grade 3-5 reactions. By definition all those cases grading at 3 and above on the ring and Messmer scale will have sufficient features to suggest likely anaphylaxis on the NAIA/FAAN definitions [2].

### **Tryptase in different reaction grades**

Median Tryptases and incremental tryptase levels rose with grade to grade 4 (Figure 1), but there was a wide range of peak tryptases with all grades, as previously documented. There was limited correlation between Tp and severity overall (Figure 1). The same was true of the UMH values (Figure 2). Significant differences between the median peak tryptase elevations ( $p < 0.0001$ ) between grade 1 all other reaction grades (2-5), with the exception of grade 2 to 3 ( $p = 0.21$ ) 3 to 4 ( $p = 0.62$ ) and 4 to 5 ( $p = 0.76$ ).

The 20% increment was most sensitive overall for detecting potential MMR, but interestingly was less sensitive in those with raised peak tryptases for either 95<sup>th</sup> or 99<sup>th</sup> centile reference ranges. 3µg increments were less sensitive in all combinations (Tables 1-3). Few changes in low level Tp below 5µg/L were above 100% although 20% changes were common (Tables [Type text]

3a and 3b). Significant differences between the median peak to trough tryptase changes ( $p < 0.0001$ ) between grade 1 all other reaction grades (2-5), with the exception of grade 2 to 3 ( $p = 0.21$ ) 3 to 4 ( $p = 0.62$ ) and 4 to 5 ( $p = 0.76$ ). Thus both peak tryptase and tryptase changes behave similarly.

### **UMH in different reaction grades**

Urinary Methyl histamine was positive in 45-68% of patients and in most patients with positive tryptases. It is more frequently positive in higher grade reactions (Figure 2 and Table 4) but overall correlation was limited.

UMH independently identifies patients with possible mediator release when there was no evidence of tryptase release, even on the most sensitive 20% criterion.

593 cases (25% of the cohort with multiple tryptases) had UMH measurements. 414 were positive for UMH (mostly UMH1). 213 UMH measurements were available for cases where the reaction was graded (Table 4 and Figure 2)

There were no strong correlation between UMH1 and T1 levels overall or in any subgroup (Correlation  $r$  all  $< 0.3$ ) unlike that reported for plasma histamine. The majority of cases had simultaneous evidence of UMH and Tryptase release consistent with previous reports.

### **UMH is raised without detectable tryptase in 3% of cases.**

100-120 cases (3% of the total cohort) were identified where UMH was raised without any detectable incremental change in tryptase (102 for  $3\mu\text{g/L}$  incremental threshold, 100 for a 20% increment in tryptase and 120 for a  $5\mu\text{g/L}$  threshold).

## Discussion

### Harmonisation of Tryptase interpretation is needed

Establishing a diagnosis of drug allergy is still an imprecise activity. There is currently no evidence based consensus on criteria for establishing the presence of mast cell mediator release (MMR). Clinical assessment has primacy, but in perioperative anaphylaxis there are many causes of hypotension and mimics of anaphylaxis, thus simply matching the WAO phenotype of anaphylaxis is of uncertain predictive value. Elevated tryptase is reported in 30-60% of reported series of anaphylaxis, but this may not translate to perioperative drug allergy or intravenous exposure. Guidelines exist to harmonise the evaluation of reactions (AAGBI, BSACI, NICE) [1] [16] [3] [17] [2] [18]. More evidence is needed for the performance characteristics of the available assays (tryptase and urinary methyl histamine) in large cohorts. Recent UK data suggests compliance with sampling recommendations can be poor [19] [20].

Tryptase presents a unique opportunity to harmonise diagnostic interpretation. There is currently a single assay in routine use worldwide currently (although there have been several methods in the literature) [9] [21] [6]. Therefore de-facto standardisation of measurement is in place.

### What is the smallest incremental change that can be reliably measured?

Rises as small as 20% or 2 $\mu$ g/L or ROC thresholds of 5-7 $\mu$ g/L have been observed to correlate with anaphylactic reactions in various studies [22, 23]. A compound index (1.2xbaseline + 2 $\mu$ g/L) has also been proposed [13] [14].

No one can reliably measure a change less than twice the routine coefficient of variation (CV) of the assay. Nor can anyone usefully translate a change of less than 2xCV this into clinical practice worldwide. Previous studies deriving ROC curves for Tryptase in small cohorts may not be translatable to other centres [15], however incremental changes may be

more translatable if validated on large series. Furthermore, clinical anaphylaxis is reported in the “absence” of mast cell mediator release.

Incremental changes [24] [23] [22] [25] [26] between 20% and >100% have been proposed to add sensitivity. Non-anaphylactic reactions show a mean 29% change from baseline, in contrast to 185% in emergency room anaphylaxis [27], allergic urticaria (49.5%) and non-steroidal drug reactions (38.2%) [28]. A 35% increment correlated well with VIT reactions [25] and a change of 2µg/L for anaphylaxis is sufficient in other scenarios [23] [22].

It is important that natural or incidental variations in tryptase baseline levels will not confound any strategy. There is very little evidence for circadian changes and the variation observed in published datasets is small. Mean changes of less than 20% have been observed in venom immunotherapy (VIT) [29], post-operative orthopaedic procedures [30], emergency room admissions and controls [31] [32]. While statistically significant, many variations are within the 2xCV limits of the total tryptase assay (20%) [32] [30]. Liver disease and alcohol consumption do not raise tryptase [33] but renal impairment [34] [35] [36], obesity [13], interference from heterophile antibodies [21] and chronic elevations of uncertain significance may (Egner personal observation).

### **Correlation between severity and peak tryptase or incremental changes is limited**

No strong correlation was seen between peak tryptase and reaction grade overall (Pearson's. Spearman's  $r = 0.3$  (CI 0.25-0.34) and Kendall's Tau ( $r = 0.23$  (CI 0.2-0.26)). The correlation between reaction severity and tryptase is always limited similar to this cohort [37] [20] [14], implying that tryptase is insensitive or there are non-allergic mimics of all grades of reaction which confound the analysis of all studies. Peak tryptases in all grades of reaction can be small and within the reference range [26]. We show a statistically significant difference in median peak tryptase (or tryptase increment) and grade 1 for all reaction grades, but not between grade 2 and 3, 3 and 4 or grade 1 and 2, possibly due to difficulties in differentiating these grades clinically.

[Type text]

## How should Tryptase be used in establishing MMR?

The clinical criteria for anaphylaxis define features that suggest anaphylaxis clinically but do not exclude mimics. To assist in establishing mast cell mediator release in perioperative allergy, we must define a standardized and robust (i.e. translatable) approach to defining changes in markers, since derivation of ROC thresholds in previous cohorts erroneously pre-supposes definitive diagnosis of drug allergy against a validated reference standard.

The role of tryptase measurement should be to reliably identify those patients with tryptase changes that **could** represent mast cell mediator release. This large case series suggests that small changes in tryptase are robustly measurable and potentially useful. We establish that a threshold of 20% increment should be the minimum change that can be measured with certainty and that a simple increment of 3  $\mu\text{g/L}$  from peak to trough may be a more specific alternative and functions similarly to the  $(1.2 \times \text{baseline} + 2)$  algorithm within the reference range. Both require large scale validation since they may identify potential tryptase release in 30-60% of patients with peak tryptases within the reference range. We show that a few additional cases of likely MMR (3%) can only be detected by UMH analysis. This may be a useful adjunct for lesser degrees of reaction which are less likely to produce large tryptase increments within the reference range.

No test is without false positives or false negatives; the 3 $\mu\text{g/L}$  strategy minimizes likely false positivity at lower levels in a similar way to previously suggested algorithms such as  $(1.2 \times \text{baseline}) + 2\mu\text{g/L}$ , but the possibility that a 20% rise may of significance at all levels of tryptase remains to be proven. Simple peak tryptase thresholds including  $T \geq 14 \mu\text{g/L}$ ,  $\geq 11.4 \mu\text{g/L}$  or lower are insensitive, with anaphylaxis and IgE mediated drug reactions seen with peak tryptases much lower than 14 $\mu\text{g/L}$  [26] [23] [24]. This series confirms that the half-life of tryptase appears to be markedly prolonged in some cases [28]. Despite these caveats, the evaluation of small serial changes is both rational and justified.

A peak tryptase of  $\geq 14\mu\text{g/l}$  is the “correct” threshold for identifying individuals with raised tryptase.  $11.4\mu\text{g/l}$  is too sensitive since 2.5% of “normal” people will always exceed this leading to erroneous suspicion of elevation in normal people (Tryptase Kit insert <http://www.phadia.com/en-GB/5/Products/ImmunoCAP-Assays/ImmunoCAP-Tryptase/> and Sheffield local validation data). Utilising incremental changes largely negates this disadvantage and gives similar performance irrespective of the threshold used (Tables 1-3).

Both strategies are independent of assumptions about accuracy of sample labelling timing or sequence. They make no assumptions about the kinetics of clearance. Laboratories wishing to interpret changes to the  $3\mu\text{g/L}$  threshold will need to establish extra IQC strategies for very low values that are not in place routinely.

### **Increments are less useful in raised tryptases**

Utilising increments in tryptase will only miss those cases with slow clearance or inappropriately short intervals between samples. Acute rises always fall, thus tryptase changes of greater than  $3\mu\text{g/l}$  can be expected in almost all of these raised samples (except 21 case where tryptase remained  $>200\mu\text{g/l}$  throughout (i.e. above the upper measuring limit of the assay). 20% increments (or the  $1.2 \times \text{Baseline} + 2$  algorithm) fare slightly less well because the absolute size of a 20% increment at  $100\mu\text{g/l}$  is  $20\mu\text{g/l}$  and at 50 it is  $10\mu\text{g/l}$ .

### **The role of Urinary Methyl Histamine**

We show that raised UMH can be seen in the absence of significantly raised tryptase [38] [13]. Further studies are needed to determine if UMH might identify additional cases of mast cell mediator release [39] [38]. In our cohort, 80% of patients with tryptase release had simultaneous UMH release. Conversely 3% had no evidence of tryptase increments (on any measure) but had positive UMH levels. This additional information may be useful increment in diagnosis and risk assessment.

### **Summary**

[Type text]

This data provides the first clear indication of the expected levels of serum tryptase in a large cohort of suspected perioperative anaphylaxis, utilising the only routinely available assay for total tryptase. UK NEQAS External quality assessment data suggest that the majority of participants have assay performance readily able to detect small increments reliably (UK NEQAS Tryptase scheme reports [www.immqas.org.uk](http://www.immqas.org.uk)) meaning that the conclusions are readily translatable to other centres provided laboratories extend their internal controls to reliably report below 3µg/L.

**Conflict of Interest:** None



**Figure legends:**

**Figure 1: Larger Tryptase changes are seen in higher grades of reaction but overall correlation is poor**

Data includes 1746 graded reactions and 307 reactions labelled anaphylaxis (grade uncertain).

Data is presented as Box and Whisker plots with medians (box shoulders = 95% Confidence intervals of median), quartiles (outer box represents 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> centiles) and max/min ranges.

Peak tryptase and peak to trough increment medians for reaction grades 3, 4 & 5 were all statistically different from grade 1 dataset (Kruskall-Wallis  $p < 0.0001$ ).

**Figure 2: There is a trend to higher peak UMH with higher grades of reaction but overall correlation is poor.**

Anaphylaxis ungraded = referral stated "anaphylaxis" but without sufficient details for accurate grading.

Data is presented as Box and Whisker plots) with medians (box shoulders = 95% Confidence intervals), quartiles (outer box represent 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> centiles) and max/min ranges.

**Table 1: Incremental changes are of most use within the reference range.**

A combination of raised tryptases and incremental changes within then reference range is best.

20% changes are more common within the reference range than 3µg/L increments within the reference range, but 5-10% of the raised tryptases do not change by these thresholds.

$\Delta Tp > 20\%$  = positive change in tryptase from trough to peak of  $\geq 20\%$

$\Delta Tp > 3\mu\text{g/L}$  = change in tryptase level from trough to peak of  $\geq 3\mu\text{g/L}$

\*21 (0.6%) additional cases where all tryptases were  $\geq 200\mu\text{g/L}$  (without any measurable increment) could be identified. 117/1053 (11%) samples  $Tp < 5\mu\text{g/L}$  have  $\Delta Tp \geq 100\%$

$\Delta Tp > 3\mu\text{g/L}$  is rare below a peak tryptase of  $5\mu\text{g/L}$ , but changes of 20% are common although most are  $< 100\%$ . 43 of 1053 samples (4%) changed between 20 and 100% in low level samples below  $Tp = 5\mu\text{g/L}$ .

	$\Delta Tp > 3\mu\text{g/L}$	$\Delta Tp > 20\%$
All Tp (Peak Tryptase) (n=3400)	1762 (52%)*	2750 (81%)
$Tp < 5$ (n=1053)	14 (1.4%)	690 (66%)
$4.9 < Tp < 14$ (n=952)	418 (44%)	743 (78%)
$Tp \geq 14$ n=1395	1330* (95%)	1316 (94%)
$4.9 < Tp < 11.4$ (n=799)	294 (37%)	664 (83%)
$Tp \geq 11.4$ (n=1548)	1452* (94%)	1395 (90%)

**Table 2: Stratified combinations of thresholds may improve detection within the reference range**

Large changes in tryptase (>100%) below a peak tryptase of 5µg/L are rare.

Enforcing a requirement for a 100% change for tryptases below 5µg/L reduces the sensitivity of a 20% threshold but makes little difference to a 3µg/L strategy.

Further studies will be required to determine the clinical predictive values of each strategy in future studies using definitive structured clinical criteria to establish evidence of acute tryptase release

	$\Delta Tp > 3\mu\text{g/L}$	$\Delta Tp > 20\%$
All Tp levels n=3400	1762 (52%)*	2750 (81%)
Tp $\geq 14$ + $\Delta Tp$ between 5-14 + $\Delta Tp > 100\%$ at $< 5$	1930 (57%)	2256 (66%)
Tp $\geq 11.4$ + $\Delta Tp$ between 5-11.4 + $\Delta Tp > 100\%$ at $< 5$	1959 (58%)	2329 (69%)

**Table 3: Incremental Tryptase changes within the reference range versus reaction grade have similar utility independent of the upper limit of the reference range used.**

**Table 3a: Using 11.4 (95<sup>th</sup> Centile) as upper limit of reference range.**

n	Reaction Grade	Tp<11.4 (n=946)		Tp>11.4 (n=800)	
		ΔTp>3μg/L	ΔTp>20%	ΔTp>3μg/L	ΔTp>20%
307	“Anaphylaxis”	29/146 (20%)	68/146 (47%)	149/164 (91%)	118/164 (72%)
230	1	32/179 (18%)	77/179 (43%)	47/51 (92%)	38/51 (76%)
259	2	21/199 (13%)	91/199 (46%)	54/60 (83%)	52/60 (87%)
575	3	64/298 (24%)	131/298 (44%)	270/277 (98%)	203/277 (73%)
641	4	37/249 (15%)	111/249 (46%)	377/391 (96%)	281/391 (72%)
41	5	5/20 (25%)	10/20 (50%)	20/21 (95%)	18/21 (86%)

**Table 3b: Using 14 (99<sup>th</sup> Centile) as upper limit of reference range.**

n	Reaction Grade	Tp<14 (n=1014)		Tp>14 (n=732)	
		ΔTp>3μg/L	ΔTp>20%	ΔTp>3μg/L	ΔTp>20%
307	“Anaphylaxis”	43/161 (27%)	78/146 (48%)	135/143 (94%)	118/143 (72%)
230	1	43/192 (22%)	87/192 (45%)	36/38 (96%)	28/38 (74%)
259	2	24/206 (12%)	102/206 (50%)	51/53 (96%)	47/53 (89%)
575	3	93/330 (26%)	133/330 (40%)	236/245 (98%)	200/245 (82%)
641	4	51/265 (19%)	123/265 (46%)	364/375 (97%)	269/375 (72%)
41	5	7/22 (32%)	13/22 (59%)	18/19 (95%)	18/19 (84%)

20% Tryptase increments are more sensitive in the normal range, but less useful in raised tryptases than a 3μg/L increment. Most rises in tryptase below a Tp of 5μg/L are above 20% but less than 100%. Changes in tryptase below 5μg/L are rarely above 100% and are similar for all grades of reaction at 4% (19/543)

**Table 4: Urinary methyl histamine identifies potential Mast cell mediator release in a further 3% (100) of cases.**

Number of cases	Reaction Grade	UMH $\geq$ 25 $\mu$ g/mmol* (any sample)	% UMH Positive
18	“anaphylaxis”	11	61
48	1	22	46
45	2	19	45
86	3	56	65
151	4	102	68
7	5	3	43

\*UMH  $>$ 25  $\mu$ g/mmol was found in 102 cases where  $\Delta$ Tp  $<$ 3 $\mu$ g/L and 120 cases where  $\Delta$ Tp  $<$ 5 $\mu$ g/L and 100 cases. In all these cases no incremental tryptase changes are detected using the 3 $\mu$ g/L or 20% incremental thresholds.

## References

1. Simons FE, Arduzzo LR, Bilo MB, et al. International consensus on (ICON) anaphylaxis. *World Allergy Organ J* 2014;7: 9.
2. Sampson HA, Munoz-Furlong A, Campbell RL, et al. Second symposium on the definition and management of anaphylaxis: summary report--second National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease/Food Allergy and Anaphylaxis Network symposium. *Ann Emerg Med* 2006;47: 373-80.
3. Harper NJ, Dixon T, Dugue P, et al. Working Party of the Association of Anaesthetists of Great B, Ireland, Suspected anaphylactic reactions associated with anaesthesia. *Anaesthesia* 2009;64: 199-211.
4. Berroa F, Lafuente A, Javaloyes G, et al. The incidence of perioperative hypersensitivity reactions: a single-center, prospective, cohort study. *Anesth Analg* 2015;121: 117-23.
5. R.Y. Lin LBS, A. Curry, G.R. Persola, et al. Histamine and tryptase levels in patients with acute allergic reactions: an emergency department-based study. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2000;106: 65-71.
6. Mertes PM, Laxenaire MC. Allergy and anaphylaxis in anaesthesia. *Minerva Anesthesiol* 2004;70: 285-91.
7. Low AE, McEwan JC, Karanam S, et al. Anaesthesia-associated hypersensitivity reactions: seven years' data from a British bi-specialty clinic. *Anaesthesia* 2016;71: 76-84.
8. Fisher MM, Ramakrishnan N, Doig G, et al. The investigation of bronchospasm during induction of anaesthesia. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2009;53: 1006-11.
9. Fisher MM, Baldo BA. Mast cell tryptase in anaesthetic anaphylactoid reactions. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 1998;80: 26-9.
10. Antunes J, Kochuyt AM, Ceuppens JL. Perioperative allergic reactions: experience in a Flemish referral centre. *Allergologia et Immunopathologia* 2014;42: 348-54.
11. Vitte JB, P., Reply: To PMID 23040367. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2013;131: 1714.
12. Wongkaewpothong P, Pacharn P, Sripramong C, et al. The utility of serum tryptase in the diagnosis of food-induced anaphylaxis. *Allergy Asthma Immunol Res* 2014;6: 304-9.
13. Sprung J, Weingarten TN, Schwartz LB. Presence or absence of elevated acute total serum tryptase by itself is not a definitive marker for an allergic reaction. *Anesthesiology* 2015;122: 713-4.
14. Sala-Cunill A, Cardona V, Labrador-Horrillo M, et al. Usefulness and limitations of sequential serum tryptase for the diagnosis of anaphylaxis in 102 patients. *Int Arch Allergy Immunol* 2013;160: 192-9.
15. Laroche D, Gomis P, Gallimidi E, et al. Diagnostic value of histamine and tryptase concentrations in severe anaphylaxis with shock or cardiac arrest during anesthesia. *Anesthesiology* 2014;121: 272-9.
16. guidance.nice.org.uk/cg134. Anaphylaxis: assessment to confirm an anaphylactic episode and the decision to refer after emergency treatment for a suspected anaphylactic episode, 2011.

17. Simons Sea, World Allergy Organization Guidelines for the Assessment and Management of Anaphylaxis. *World Allergy Organ J* 2011; 13 -37.
18. Ewan PW, Dugue P, Mirakian R, et al. BSACI guidelines for the investigation of suspected anaphylaxis during general anaesthesia. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2010;40: 15-31.
19. Krishna MT, York M, Chin T, et al. Multi-centre retrospective analysis of anaphylaxis during general anaesthesia in the United Kingdom: aetiology and diagnostic performance of acute serum tryptase. *Clin Exp Immunol* 2014;178: 399-404.
20. Srivastava S, Huissoon AP, Barrett V, et al. Systemic reactions and anaphylaxis with an acute serum tryptase >14 mug/L: retrospective characterisation of aetiology, severity and adherence to National Institute of Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines for serial tryptase measurements and specialist referral. *J Clin Pathol* 2014;67: 614-9.
21. Sargur R, Cowley D, Murng S, et al. Raised tryptase without anaphylaxis or mastocytosis: heterophilic antibody interference in the serum tryptase assay. *Clin Exp Immunol* 2011;163: 339-45.
22. Brown S, Blackman, K. and Heddle, R. Can serum mast cell tryptase help diagnose anaphylaxis? *Emerg Med Australas* 2004;16: 120-24.
23. Brown SG, Stone SF, Fatovich DM, et al. Stone SF, Brown SG, Blackman KE, Heddle RJ, Can serum mast cell tryptase help diagnose anaphylaxis? *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2013;132: 1141-49.
24. De Schryver S, Halbrich M, Clarke A, et al. Tryptase levels in children presenting with anaphylaxis: Temporal trends and associated factors. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2016;137: 1138-42.
25. Borer-Reinhold M, Haeberli G, Bitzenhofer M, et al. An increase in serum tryptase even below 11.4 ng/mL may indicate a mast cell-mediated hypersensitivity reaction: a prospective study in Hymenoptera venom allergic patients. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2011;41: 1777-83.
26. Berroa F, Lafuente A, Javaloyes G, et al. The usefulness of plasma histamine and different tryptase cut-off points in the diagnosis of perianaesthetic hypersensitivity reactions. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2014;44: 270-7.
27. Enrique E, Garcia-Ortega P, Sotorra O, et al. Usefulness of UniCAP-Tryptase fluoroimmunoassay in the diagnosis of anaphylaxis. *Allergy* 1999;54: 602-6.
28. Ordoqui E, Zubeldia JM, Aranzabal A, et al. Serum tryptase levels in adverse drug reactions. *Allergy* 1997;52: 1102-5.
29. Dugas-Breit S, Przybilla B, Dugas M, et al. Serum concentration of baseline mast cell tryptase: evidence for a decline during long-term immunotherapy for Hymenoptera venom allergy. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2010;40: 643-9.
30. Garvey LH, Bech B, Mosbech H, et al. Effect of general anesthesia and orthopedic surgery on serum tryptase. *Anesthesiology* 2010;112: 1184-9.
31. Skaaby T, Vestergaard H, Thomsen S, et al. No changes in serum tryptase after bariatric surgery. *Ann Epidemiol* 2015;25: 800-1.
32. Dugas-Breit S, Przybilla B, Schopf P, Rueff F, Possible circadian variation of serum mast cell tryptase concentration. *Allergy* 2005;60: 689-92.
33. Beceiro C, Campos J, Valcarcel MA, et al. Serum concentrations of mast cell tryptase are reduced in heavy drinkers. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 2015;39: 672-8.



34. Dugas-Breit S, Schopf P, Dugas M, et al. Baseline serum levels of mast cell tryptase are raised in hemodialysis patients and associated with severity of pruritus. *J Dtsch Dermatol Ges* 2005;3: 343-7.
35. Barczyk M, Mysliwiec M, Kalinowski M, et al. Mast cells tryptase in patients after renal transplantation. *Transplantation Proceedings* 2008;40: 3437-9.
36. Sirvent AE, Gonzalez C, Enriquez R, et al. Serum tryptase levels and markers of renal dysfunction in a population with chronic kidney disease. *J Nephrology* 2010;23: 282-90.
37. Licari A, De Amici M, Nigrisoli S, et al. Tryptase and Histamine May Support Oral Food Challenge in the Diagnosis of Allergy. *J Biol Regul Homeost Agents* 2015;29: 1-7.
38. van Toorenenbergen AW, Oranje AP. Comparison of serum tryptase and urine N-methylhistamine in patients with suspected mastocytosis. *Clin Chimica Acta* 2005;359: 72-7.
39. Beyer K, Niggemann B, Schulze S, Wahn U, Serum tryptase and urinary 1-methylhistamine as parameters for monitoring oral food challenges in children. *Int ArchAllergy Immunol* 1994;104: 348-51.