

Effect-modifying impact of age on sex-based differences during oral immunotherapy

Charles Elbany, Camille Braun, Selma Lazizi, Louis Paradis, Anne Des Roches, Kathryn Samaan, Roxane Labrosse, François Graham, Philippe Bégin

► To cite this version:

Charles Elbany, Camille Braun, Selma Lazizi, Louis Paradis, Anne Des Roches, et al.. Effect-modifying impact of age on sex-based differences during oral immunotherapy. Allergy, 2023, 79 (2), pp.526-529. 10.1111/all.15980 . hal-04946302

HAL Id: hal-04946302 https://hal.science/hal-04946302v1

Submitted on 17 Feb 2025

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

DOI: 10.1111/all.15980

526

Effect-modifying impact of age on sex-based differences during oral immunotherapy

To the Editor,

Epidemiological studies have consistently reported significant sexbased disparities in the prevalence of atopic disease.^{1,2} In food allergy, the 1:1.8 female-to-male ratio observed in children was shown to be completely reversed after puberty at 1:0.53, and then to normalize after menopause.³ This likely reflects the biological effect of sex hormones on mast cells and cytokine production.⁴ The reason for male predominance during childhood is unknown but may take root in utero.⁵ There is a lack of data on how sex-based differences impact therapeutic response.⁶

Here, we sought to assess sex-based differences in the rapeutic response to oral immunotherapy (OIT) in a large cohort of patients aged 7 months to 46 years (see Data S1). When considering the whole cohort, 573 of 909 patients (63.0%) were male, and the only observable difference between sex was age (Table 1). Female patients in the cohort were in average 1 year older than male patients (p = .02). The female-to-male ratio was 1:1.84 before the age of 13 (n = 849), after which it decreased to 1:1.26 (n = 160).

When stratifying for age, asthma was found significantly less prevalent in females (OR 0.66, p = .03) before 13. There was no other sex-based difference in baseline characteristics prior to treatment in the subgroups.

When assessing treatment tolerance, females under 13 were less likely to experience reactions graded CoFAR 3 and above (OR 0.46, p = .04) than males. In contrast, after 13, females experienced significantly more reactions graded CoFAR 2 and above (OR 2.03, p = .03). For both variables (CoFAR 2 vs 3), the effect of female sex was significantly different before and after the age of 13 (p = .006 and p = .004, respectively). Age was also found to modify the effect of sex on respiratory symptoms (p = .02), anaphylaxis (p = .04), or epinephrine use (p = .02).

In multivariate analysis, sex and age were not individually associated with severity of dose-related reactions. However, the interaction term between the two was found to be an independent predictor of dose-related reaction severity, along with baseline asthma, higher food-specific IgE and lower total IgE (Table 2).

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study reporting sex-based differences in OIT. The observed interaction with raises a concern that sex-based differences can be missed unless analyses specifically control for it. Proper assessment of sex-based differences in OIT is critical to ensure equal quality of care for male and female patients. Small cohorts and clinical trials that lack power to assess such interactions should nevertheless stratify sex-based data by age, so that relevant trends can be observed and eventually combined to allow proper analysis.

The main limitation of our study is its retrospective design relying on patient chart review. The smaller proportion of patients older than 13 may have limited our ability to detect significant differences in this subgroup. For example, while we were able to show that female sex affects epinephrine use differently before and after the age of 13, we lacked power to conclude whether this difference is driven by a reduced risk in female children, an increased risk in females after puberty, or both. We could not separate the biologic effect of sex from the behavioral effect of gender, which could have influenced patient decisions regarding use of medication, dose observance, co-factor avoidance, and symptom reporting.

In conclusion, our data show that sex-based differences exist in OIT but depend on an interaction with patient age. To avoid missing clinically relevant sex-based differences, future studies assessing the effect of sex in OIT should be stratified for age or otherwise account for this interaction. These will help better inform decisions on whether and when to initiate OIT in female patients and could eventually lead to personalized approaches according to sex.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction

in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

© 2023 The Authors. Allergy published by European Academy of Allergy and Clinical Immunology and John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

TABLE 1 Age and sex interaction on risk of reactions during oral immunotherapy.

_	Allergy	EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF ALLERGY AND CLENICAL IMMUNOLOGY	EAACI	-W	IL	EY-	
---	---------	--	-------	----	----	-----	--

				Effect of female sex (OR with 95% CI)				Diffe		
	Male (n = 573	Female 3) (<i>n</i> = 336)	Whole coho	ort	Patients <13 years		Patients ≥13 years	befoi	rence in effect œ vs after ars (p-value)
Age ≥13 years old	85 (14.8%)	75 (22.3	3%)	1.46 (1.05-2	2.05)	-		-	-	
Comorbidities										
Asthma	232 (40.5%)	121 (36	.0%)	0.83 (0.63-3	1.09)	0.66 (0.48-0.9	1)	1.38 (0.7–2.52)	.03	
Atopic dermatitis	330 (57.6%)	179 (53	.3%)	0.84 (0.64-	1.10)	0.86 (0.63-1.17	7)	0.93 (0.51–1.70)	.83	
Allergic rhinitis	215 (37.5%)	123 (36	.6%)	0.96 (0.73-1	1.27)	0.83 (0.60-1.16	5)	1.00 (0.54–1.88)	.60	
Worst reaction pre-OIT										
CoFAR 2 and above	286 (49.9%)	155 (46	.1%)	0.86 (0.66-	1.12)	0.76 (0.56-1.03	3)	1.10 (0.59–2.04)	.29	
CoFAR 3 and above	169 (29.5%)	93 (27.7	%)	0.92 (0.68-2	1.23)	0.78 (0.55-1.13	3)	1.03 (0.57–1.87)	.44	
CoFAR 4	36 (6.3%)	16 (4.8%	6)	0.75 (0.41-1	L.37)	0.64 (0.31-1.35	5)	0.94 (0.31–2.83)	.58	
Allergens included in OIT										
Peanut	363 (63.4%)	212 (63	.1%)	0.99 (0.75-1	1.31)	1.06 (0.77-1.46	5)	0.85 (0.46–1.55)	.52	
Hen's egg	174 (30.4%)	108 (32	.1%)	1.09 (0.81-1	1.45)	1.04 (0.75-1.44	4)	1.64 (0.80-3.35)	.23	
Cow's milk	143 (25.0%)	72 (21.4	%)	0.72 (0.59-1	1.13)	0.74 (0.51-1.07	')	1.19 (0.59–2.39)	.26	
Sesame	100 (17.5%)	70 (20.8	3%)	1.25 (0.89-2	1.75)	1.27 (0.87-1.84	4)	1.31 (0.57–3.01)	.94	
Treenuts	186 (32.5%)	115 (34	.2%)	1.08 (0.81-1	1.44)	1.22 (0.88-1.67	7)	0.71 (0.37–1.38)	.15	
Others	139 (24.3%)	68 (20.2	2%)	0.79 (0.57-1	1.10)	0.73 (0.51-1.06	5)	1.23 (0.58–1.20)	.22	
Two allergens or more	302 (52.7%)	160 (47.	6%)	0.82 (0.62-2	1.07)	0.83 (0.61-1.12	<u>2)</u>	0.91 (0.49–1.67)	.79	
Omalizumab	121 (21.1%)	68 (20.2	2%)	0.95 (0.68-2	1.32)	0.55 (0.30-1.02	2)	1.82 (0.82–4.03)	.09	
Worst reaction during OI	Г									
CoFAR 1 and above	261 (45.5%)	159 (47.	3%)	1.07 (0.82-1	1.41)	0.96 (0.71-1.31)	1.38 (0.75–2.52)	.30	
CoFAR 2 and above	101 (17.6%)	61 (18.2	:%)	1.04 (0.73-2	1.47)	0.65 (0.41-1.03	3)	2.03 (1.08-3.83)	.004	
CoFAR 3 and above	54 (9.5%)	28 (8.3%	6)	0.87 (0.54-3	1.41)	0.46 (0.23-0.9	0)	2.00 (0.89-4.48)	.006	
CoFAR 4	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)		-		-		-	-	
Systems involved										
Skin	117 (20.4%)	73 (21.7	'%)	1.08 (0.78-2	1.50)	1.03 (0.71-1.51)	1.19 (0.59–2.39)	.73	
Gastro-intestinal	184 (32.1%)	111 (33	.0%)	1.04 (0.78-2	1.39)	0.91 (0.65-1.27	7)	1.29 (0.71–2.35)	.31	
Respiratory	58 (10.1%)	31 (9.2%	6)	0.90 (0.57-1	1.43)	0.55 (0.30-1.02	2)	1.82 (0.82–4.03)	.02	
Anaphylaxis	64 (11.2%)	39 (11.6	%)	1.04 (0.68-2	1.59)	0.68 (0.39-1.20	D)	1.76 (0.85–3.62)	.04	
Epinephrin use	44 (7.7%)	25 (7.4%	6)	0.97 (0.58-1	1.61)	0.52 (0.25-1.08	3)	2.10 (0.88–4.97)	.02	
OIT discontinued	35 (6.1%)	27 (8.0%	6)	1.34 (0.80-	2.26)	1.00 (0.50-1.99	9)	1.73 (0.73–4.06)	.33	
			Effect o	t of female sex (mean difference with 95% CI)					Differe)ifference in effect
	Male (n = 573)	Female (n = 336)	Whole o	cohort	Patie	nts <13 years	Pati	ents ≥13 years		vs after s (p-value)
Age, y (mean \pm SD)	7.7±6.1	8.7±7.6	1.06 (0).15-1.96)	-		-		-	
Highest sIgE, log2 kUI/L (mean, SD)	3.6 ± 2.8	3.2±2.8	-0.40 (-	0.83-0.29)	-0.42	2 (-0.91-0.06)	-0.6	51 (-1.50-0.28)	.60	
Total IgE, log2 kUI/L (mean, SD)	8.2 ± 2.1	7.9±2.2	-0.25 (-	-0.57-0.07)	-0.32	2 (-0.69-0.05)	-0.2	23 (-0.80-0.35)	.79	
Updosing phase, days (mean, SD)	302±242	300±223	-2 (-	-35-31)	-8	8 (-44-29)	2	21 (-60-101)	.50	

Note: Bold indicates statistically significant findings (p < .05).

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; CoFAR, consortium for food allergy research grade; OIT, oral immunotherapy; OR, Odds ratio; slgE, specific IgE.

527

TABLE 2 Multivariate analysis of predictors of severity of dose-related reactions during oral immunotherapy.

	OR (95% confidence interval)	p-Value
Independent predictors for reaction CoFAR 2 or greater		
Asthma	1.60 (1.01-2.51)	.04
Interaction term: age >13 years and female sex	3.38 (1.80-6.35)	<.001
Highest sIgE, log2 kU/L	1.29 (1.18–1.41)	<.001
Independent predictors for reaction CoFAR 3 or greater		
Asthma	2.44 (1.29-4.62)	.006
Interaction term: age >13 years and female sex	2.78 (1.27-6.06)	.01
Total IgE, log2 kU/L	0.75 (0.62-0.92)	.005
Highest sIgE, log2 kU/L	1,47 (1.24–1.74)	<.001

Note: Logistical regression was performed using ascending conditional approach starting with all variables from Table 1, as well as an interaction term for age and sex.

Abbreviations: CoFAR, consortium for food allergy research; OR, odds ratio; slgE, specific lgE.

KEYWORDS

age, food allergy, gender, oral immunotherapy, safety, sex, sexbased differences, tolerance

FUNDING INFORMATION

Anaforcal; Fondation du CHU Sainte-Justine; Fonds de Recherche du Québec - Santé; Société Française d'Allergologie

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

CB, LP, AD, KS, RL, FG, and PB evaluated and documented patient data. CE, SL, and PB conceived the study and collected the data. CE, CB, and PB analyzed the data and drafted the manuscript. All authors critically reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was supported by the Ste-Justine Foundation. PB was supported by the Fonds de recherches en Santé du Québec (281662). CE was supported by the SFA (Société Française d'Allergologie) and the ANAFORCAL (Association Nationale de Formation Continue en Allergologie).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

> Charles Elbany^{1,2,3} Camille Braun^{1,4,5} Selma Lazizi^{1,6} Louis Paradis^{1,6} Anne Des Roches¹ Kathryn Samaan¹ Roxane Labrosse¹

¹Department of Pediatrics, Section of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Sainte-Justine, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

²AP-HP, Hôpital Necker-Enfants Malades, Service de

Pneumologie et Allergologie Pédiatriques, Paris, France ³Service de Pédiatrie, Centre Hospitalier Intercommunal de Créteil, Créteil, France

⁴Department of Pediatrics, Pneumology, Allergy, Cystic Fibrosis, Hôpital Femme Mère Enfant, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Bron, France

⁵Centre International de Recherche en Infectiologie, INSERM U1111, CNRS UMR 5308, Université Lyon 1, ENS de Lyon, Lyon, France

⁶Department of Medicine, Section of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Correspondence

Philippe Bégin, Department of Pediatrics, Section of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Sainte-Justine, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Email: philippe.begin.med@ssss.gouv.qc.ca

REFERENCES

- Chen W, Mempel M, Schober W, Behrendt H, Ring J. Gender difference, sex hormones, and immediate type hypersensitivity reactions. *Allergy*. 2008;63(11):1418-1427.
- Pali-Schöll I, Jensen-Jarolim E. Gender aspects in food allergy. Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol. 2019;19(3):249-255.
- 3. Kelly C, Gangur V. Sex disparity in food allergy: evidence from the PubMed database. *J Allergy*. 2009;2009(159845):1-7.
- Bouman A, Heineman MJ, Faas MM. Sex hormones and the immune response in humans. *Hum Reprod Update*. 2005;11(4): 411-423.

François Graham^{1,6} Philippe Bégin^{1,6}



529

- 5. Halonen M, Stern D, Lyle S, Wright A, Taussig L, Martinez FD. Relationship of total serum IgE levels in cord and 9-month sera of infants. Clin Htmlent Glyphamp Asciiamp Exp Allergy. 1991:21(2):235-241.
- 6. Jenkins CR, Boulet LP, Lavoie KL, Raherison-Semjen C, Singh D. Personalized treatment of asthma: the importance of sex and gender differences. J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract. 2022;10(4):963-971.e3.

DOI: 10.1111/all.15989

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

Obesity increases allergic airway inflammation that can be successfully treated by oral tolerance

To the Editor.

The prevalence of obesity and allergy has increased in developed countries over the last decades,^{1,2} leading to the hypothesis that these two noncommunicable diseases might be linked. It remains unclear whether obesity, characterized by chronic low-grade inflammation that affects host immunity, contributes to the exacerbation of respiratory allergies. Additionally, the efficacy of inducing mucosal tolerance as a prophylactic intervention against allergic airway disease in obese individuals is still a subject of inquiry. The impact of obesity on immune responses has been demonstrated in vaccinated individuals, revealing diminished vaccine efficacy and impaired duration of protection.³ Our current study investigates whether obesity could impact respiratory allergy development and the induction of mucosal allergen-specific tolerance.

Male C57BL/6 mice fed with a high-fat diet (HFD) or standard chow diet (STD) for 9 weeks were immunized/sensitized and then challenged with ovalbumin (OVA) (Figure S1A). To induce allergenspecific tolerance, mice were orally treated with OVA before sensitization (Appendix S1).

We detected significant differences in body weight between STD and HFD-fed mice, whereby HFD-fed mice had twice the body weight and significantly higher serum leptin levels than STD-fed mice at the time of sacrifice (Figure 1A,B). Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) of the cecal content demonstrated distinct spectra between obese and lean mice (Figure 1C-F). These findings were confirmed by 16S rRNA gene sequencing, showing that gut microbial profiles of the cecal content significantly differed between obese and lean mice, consistent with other studies.⁴ Specifically, alpha (Figure 1G) and beta (Figure 1H) diversity results revealed that (i) the obese group exhibited significantly lower diversity levels than the lean group and (ii) microbial community structure was strongly affected by diet type (Figure 1I, S2, Table S1).

Obesity exacerbates the allergic response in mice, with sensitization and challenge with OVA leading to significantly heightened manifestations compared to lean mice. This is evidenced by elevated levels of allergen-specific IgE in bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) and serum (Figure 2A,B), as well as increased levels of IL-5 and IL-13 in the lungs (Figure 2C,D). Eosinophils, B cells, and T cells were upregulated in the lungs of allergic obese compared to allergic lean (Figure 2E,H,I), which explains the significantly higher OVA-specific IL-13 levels (Figure 2D) and exacerbated lung inflammation in the allergic obese group (Figure 2F,G). The rise in Tregs (Figure 2J) was also evident, and this increase could potentially be attributed to the overall expansion of T cells in allergic obese animals.

Interestingly, obesity did not influence the capacity to develop oral tolerance (OT), and tolerized obese mice exhibited a nonallergic phenotype similar to that observed in lean animals. Our results demonstrate an efficient downregulation of allergic parameters upon tolerization (Figure 2A-J; Allergy vs. OT groups), including IgE levels locally and systemically (Figure 2A,B), OVAspecific IL-5/IL-13 (Figure 2C,D), and decreased lung inflammation (Figure 2F,G). Although significant differences were observed in microbial compounds, microbial diversity, and community structure between obese and lean mice (Figure 1C-I), no additional changes were evident based on the treatment (Allergy, OT, PBS) approach (Figure 2K-M).

We hypothesized that a pro-inflammatory state in the gut of obese mice influenced the microenvironment in the mucus layer around the pulmonary tissue affecting different immune cells, including macrophages. We observed a shift in distributions of activated M1 and M2 macrophages in obese PBS-treated control relative to its lean counterpart. Allergic obese showed a significant reduction of M1 compared to the obese PBS control.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

^{© 2023} The Authors. Allergy published by European Academy of Allergy and Clinical Immunology and John Wiley & Sons Ltd.