



Vaccination of children with egg allergy, with a vaccine containing egg residue.

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | bmjopen-2011-000186 |
| Article Type: | Research |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 09-Jun-2011 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Forsdahl, Bård; University Hospital of North Norway, Pediatrics |
| Primary Subject Heading: | Paediatrics |
| Keywords: | Paediatric infectious disease & immunisation < PAEDIATRICS, IMMUNOLOGY, Change management < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Peer Review Only

1
2
3 bmjopen-2011-000168
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 Vaccination of children with egg allergy, with vaccine containing egg
15 residue.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Bård Anders Forsdahl

25 For the moment on a sabbatical at:

26 Center for Excellence in Pulmonary Biology

27 Divisions of Pulmonary, Asthma, and Critical Care Medicine

28 Lucille Salter Packard Childrens Hospital at Stanford

29 770 Welch Road, Suite 350

30 Palo Alto, CA 94306

31 USA

32 Tel: +1-(650) 630-9230

33 Fax: +1 (650) 723-5201

34 E-mail: forsdahl@c2i.net
35
36
37
38
39

40 Department of Pediatrics

41 University Hospital of North Norway

42 Tromsø

43 Norway
44
45
46
47

48 Keywords: Vaccination, Egg Allergic, Influenza Vaccine,
49

50 Word count: 2826
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Article summary

Article focus:

-We wanted to vaccinate the children severely affected by their egg allergy with the same vaccine as the rest of the norwegian population got, and that contained egg residue.

Key message:

-It is safe to vaccinated egg allergic children that is severely affected by their allergy with a vaccine with a low level of egg residue.

-The level of serum specific IgE does not predict a reaction to the vaccine.

-Children tested positive for egg allergy with serum specific IgE and that has never been exposed to egg, should be treated as if they had had a serious reaction towards egg.

Strengths and limitations of this study:

-The strength of this study is that it is the same doctor that has reviewed all the patients before vaccination, and also when there were patients with possible reactions.

-It is a thorough evaluation of all the patients before they are designated to get the vaccine split or as one dose.

-The weakness is that the numbers are rather small.

Abstract

The World Health Organisation recommended in July 2009 vaccination against pandemic influenza A H1N1 virus. Norwegian health authorities recommended October 2009 vaccination of the whole Norwegian population. For subjects with egg allergy this imposed a problem because the only vaccine available in Norway until December 4, 2009 (Pandemrix) contained egg protein. The pediatric outpatient clinic, University Hospital North Norway, vaccinated 81 children and adolescents with Pandemrix, vaccine against influenza A H1N1, 42 (52%) got the vaccine as one dose. The Pandemrix vaccine used had an Ovalbumin content less than 0.66 microgram/ml. A total of 64 patients (79%) had other atopic disease besides egg allergy. There were no serious adverse reactions, only one mild allergic reaction and further two possible reactions to the vaccine. This study indicates that it is safe to vaccinate children even with severe egg allergy selecting a split vaccine approach, according to the reaction against egg.

Introduction

The fall of 2009 showed an emerging pandemic of the influenza virus A H1N1. The World Health Organisation (WHO) recommended vaccination against this virus (1). In October 2009 The Norwegian health authorities (NHA) recommended vaccination of the whole Norwegian population. (2). The information from WHO, American Center for Disease Control (ACDC)

1
2
3 and American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) all (3,4,5) warned against
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

and American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) all (3,4,5) warned against
vaccinating patients with severe egg allergy with the available vaccine,
Pandemrix from Glaxo Smith Kline (GSK). This vaccine contained egg-
protein (Ovalbumin) residue. It was said that there would be an egg-free
vaccine available. However, the first doses of this vaccine were not
available in Norway before the first week of December 2009 (6) and in a
very limited number of doses. It was recommended (7) that patients with egg
allergy should be examined by a physician with a special competence in
allergies. Patients with anaphylactic shock to egg should not get the vaccine,
those with a severe reaction to egg should have a skin prick test, and then
decide whether or not the individual should be vaccinated. A severe reaction
was regarded as one of the following reactions, urticaria, angioedema, airway
oedema, asthma, rhinitis or vomiting.

The pediatric outpatient clinic at the University Hospital North Norway has
6000 consultations per year, approximately half of these consultations
concerning atopic diseases. In an article from October 2009 (8), it was
recommended to use a two-arm approach when vaccinating patients allergic
to egg with influenza vaccine containing less than 1.2 microgram/ml
Ovalbumin. According to the producer of the vaccine (GSK), Pandemrix
contained less than 0.66 microgram/ml Ovalbumin (9). All the patients able
to eat food containing even only the slightest amount of egg should receive
the vaccine at the community centre and not at the hospital. We vaccinated

1
2
3 81 children and adolescents. Originally the recommendation was to get two
4
5 doses of the vaccine, however before we could vaccinate the second time,
6
7 new information from the NHA came in December 2009 (10), indicating
8
9 that the immune response was sufficient with one vaccine dose. The
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Regional Committee for research ethics had no objections to this study.

Material and Method

The vaccinations took place from November 4 to December 1 2009. There were 50 (62%) boys and 31 (38%) girls. Mean age 6 years 6 months. The patients were partly under our care, and partly referred to us for vaccination from their general practitioner. There were two inclusion criteria, and both had to be met. The first criterion was a diagnosed allergy to egg, with a positive skin prick test (SPT), or positive serum analysis for specific IgE (SSIgE) mediated egg allergy. The SPT was considered positive with a wheal more than 3 mm, the SSIgE was analyzed with either Immulite from Siemens, or Immunocap from Phadia (11), values over 0.35 kU/L were considered positive. The second criterion was staying on an egg free diet, unable to eat food containing any amount of egg, without an allergic reaction to egg protein. We registered patients with other atopic diseases only if they were on current medication for asthma, allergy, eczema, or on a food avoiding diet other than egg. The other atopic diseases had been diagnosed

1
2
3 by a physician prior to vaccination. No other diseases than atopic diseases
4
5
6 was registered.
7
8
9

10
11 All patients received an appointment at the outpatient clinic. One nurse was
12
13 assigned every day to do the vaccination. The same physician (BF) did all
14
15 the interviews, examinations and evaluations for all patients, and decided
16
17 whether they should get the vaccine fractioned or not. All patients had an
18
19 interview and a physical examination. A form was filled out with a written
20
21 ordination of which vaccination the patient should receive. Included on the
22
23 form was the dosage of i.m. adrenaline, i.v. hydrocortisone and p.o. anti-
24
25 histamine in case of a severe allergic reaction.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 All the patients could be vaccinated, all the asthmatics were in a stable phase
37
38 of their asthma. Two of the children had a very severe atopic eczema at the
39
40 time of vaccination. One of them was an inpatient because of the eczema.
41
42 Any reaction occurring while the patients were at the outpatient clinic was
43
44 registered by the nurse and examined by the same doctor that had done the
45
46 initial assessment. Every reaction except soreness at the injection site was
47
48
49
50
51 registered.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 No new blood samples were taken for diagnosing allergy, as we relied on the
5
6 available information. This is the same approach that has to be taken if a
7
8 mass vaccination has to take place.
9

10
11 The dose of vaccine was age dependent, 0.25 ml for those under 10 years of
12
13 age, and 0.5 ml for those over 10 years.
14
15
16

17
18
19
20 The patients were divided into two groups as described by M Erlewyn-
21
22 Lajennesse et al (8). The groups got either a fractioned dose of vaccine with
23
24 first 1/10 dose and after 30 minutes the remaining 9/10 of the dose. The other
25
26 group got the vaccine as a single dose. The criteria for getting the fractioned
27
28 dose were, prior anaphylaxis, cardiovascular complications or collapse. This
29
30 includes respiratory symptoms, hypotension and circulatory shock and severe
31
32 abdominal pain, when exposed to egg protein
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 The criteria for the single dose was mild gastrointestinal and dermatological
40
41 reactions, including urticaria, angioedema and vomiting, when exposed to
42
43 egg protein
44
45
46

47
48 One of the recommendations in the article was not followed. M Erlewyn-
49
50 Lajunnesse et.al. recommend that patients with a known allergy to egg, but
51
52 without ever being exposed to egg in any form should get the vaccine as a
53
54 single dose at the hospital. Because the reaction to egg was unknown it was
55
56 decided to vaccinate these patients with a fractioned dose.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The patients waited 30 minutes between the fractioned doses, and 60 minutes
5
6 after the final fractioned dose. The patients receiving a single dose waited 30
7
8 minutes before they left the clinic. The patients and parents were encouraged
9
10 to give us feedback if there was a delayed allergic reaction after they got
11
12 home.
13
14

15
16
17 All patients and parents were informed that vaccinating patients with egg
18
19 allergy with this vaccine was discouraged by the NHA, but there were reason
20
21 to believe that they still could be vaccinated, and some articles published
22
23 indicated the same (8, 12). They were also informed that the vaccination was
24
25 done at the outpatient clinic in case of a reaction. Both patients and parents
26
27 expressed their confidence in the treatment and information they were given.
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Results**

34
35 A total of 81 (100%)patients (50 boys and 31 girls) were enrolled, and all of
36
37 them got vaccinated. Mean age was 6.5 years, ranging from 10 months to
38
39 22.2 years. The oldest patient in this study was a mother who came to get her
40
41 daughter vaccinated, and ended up being vaccinated herself. Mean age of
42
43 those getting the vaccine fractioned was 6 years 9 months, and those getting
44
45 single dose vaccine were 6 years 3 months.
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Table 1 shows the number of vaccinated patients according to age,
53
54 fractioning of vaccine dose , previous exposure to egg and concurring atopic
55
56 diseases.
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Number (N) of vaccinated patients, % with fractioning of vaccine

dose, % with previous exposure to egg, % with concurring atopic disease in addition to allergy to egg according to age

| Age group (years) | Number of patients (%) | Fractioned dose (%) | Never exposed to egg (%) | Atopy (%) | Asthma (%) | Food allergy (%) | Inhalation allergy (%) | Eczema (%) |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------|------------|------------------|------------------------|------------|
| 0-4 | 38 (47%) | 18 (47%) | 10 (26%) | 29 (76%) | 15 (39%) | 17 (45%) | 6 (16%) | 24 (63%) |
| 5-9 | 23 (28%) | 12 (52%) | 8 (35%) | 16 (70%) | 9 (39%) | 7 (30%) | 6 (26%) | 8 (35%) |
| 10-14 | 16 (20%) | 6 (38%) | 1 (6%) | 15 (94%) | 12 (75%) | 7 (44%) | 11 (69%) | 6 (38%) |
| 15-19 | 3 (4%) | 2 (67%) | 0 | 3 (100%) | 3 (100%) | 1 (33%) | 1 (33%) | 0 |
| 20-> | 1 (1%) | 1 (100%) | 0 | 1 (100%) | 1 (100%) | 0 | 1 (100%) | 0 |
| Sum | 81 (100%) | 39 (48%) | 19 (23%) | 64 (79%) | 40 (49%) | 32 (40%) | 25 (31%) | 38 (47%) |

A total of 73 patients (90%) had a positive SSIgE test, however for 2 of these patients the exact value of SSIgE test was not known to us. The remaining 8 (10%) patients had only the skin prick test showing reaction to egg.

The median SSIgE level against egg-protein, for the whole group, was 14.0 kU/L. 11 (15%) patients had an SSIgE >99 kU/L, 25 (35%) patients had an SSIgE between 0.8-8.3 kU/L.

Table 2. Range and median value of age and SSIgE according to age group and whether the dose was fractioned or not.

| Age group (years) | Single or fractioned dose | Age range in years | Age (median) | SSIgE range (kU/L) | SSIgE median (kU/L) |
|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| 0-4 | fractioned dose | 0.8 – 4.3 | 2 years 6 months | 1.6- >99 | 21.1 |
| 0-4 | single dose | 0.9 – 4.6 | 2 years 11 months | 0.8- >99 | 46.0 |
| 5-9 | fractioned dose | 6.0 – 9.5 | 7 years 2 months | 1.3->99 | 19.7 |
| 5-9 | single dose | 5.0 – 9.9 | 6 years 11 months | 1.6- >99 | 12.5 |
| 10-14 | fractioned dose | 10.0 – 13.8 | 12 years 7 months | 1.0- >99 | 12.3 |
| 10-14 | single dose | 10.0 – 14.3 | 12 years 3 months | 0.8- >99 | 16.2 |

1
2
3 Of the 81 patients, 39 (48%) got the vaccine fractionated and 42 (52%) as a
4
5
6 single dose. The groups of patients receiving the vaccine fractionated or as one
7
8
9 dose were indistinguishable regarding age, SSIgE level, and time since the
10
11
12 SSIgE level was done. The median range of SSIgE shows no differences
13
14
15 between the groups receiving the vaccine fractionated or not.

16
17 A surprisingly high number of patients 19 (23%) had according to their
18
19
20 parents, never been exposed to egg. These patients had for some reason been
21
22
23 tested for egg allergy. The test had shown elevated SSIgE levels against egg
24
25
26 protein, and they had consequently avoided egg thereafter. The testing had
27
28
29 happened before they had had a chance to be exposed to egg. At our clinic,
30
31
32 patients with suspicious allergies to other food or a severe atopic eczema will
33
34
35 routinely be tested for food allergies, including egg allergy.

36
37 A high number of patients 64 (79%) had other atopic diseases than food
38
39
40 allergy to egg and 40 (49%) patients were treated for asthma. There was a
41
42
43 slight difference between the two groups regarding other atopic disease in
44
45
46 addition to egg allergy as 32 (82%) of the patients getting fractionated dose
47
48
49 and 30 (71%) of those getting single dose had other atopic diseases, asthma
50
51
52 being the main difference.

53
54 A total of 38 (47%) patients had an ongoing eczema. There were 44 (54%)
55
56
57 patients with other allergies besides egg allergy. There were registered 135
58
59
60 allergies among the 44 patients. Food allergies were the most common with
32 (40%) patients, 25 (31%) of the patients presented with an inhalation

1
2
3 allergy. There were no differences between the groups getting fractioned or
4
5
6 single dose vaccine regarding food or inhalation allergy.
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 **Description of reactions** 15

16
17
18
19
20 Despite that the patients and their parents were encouraged to contact the
21
22 outpatient clinic after the vaccination if a delayed allergic reaction occurred;
23
24
25 nobody reported any problems after being vaccinated.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Four patients had symptoms shortly after the vaccination. The first patient
33
34 had a confirmed mild allergic reaction to the vaccine. The two other patients
35
36 had symptoms that perhaps could be related to a reaction against the vaccine.
37
38
39 The fourth patient had symptoms due to fear of being exposed to a vaccine
40
41 containing egg. The three first patients had never been exposed to egg, and
42
43 the fourth patient had experienced anaphylactic reaction eating food
44
45 containing egg. All of four patients got a fractioned vaccine, and all had an
46
47 SSIgE taken within the last month before vaccination, except for the 8 year
48
49 old who had a 3 year old SSIgE.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The patient with the mild reaction was a 2 years and 8 months, asthma, food
allergies (milk, fish, peas, peanuts), SSIgE 1.7 kU/L and never been exposed

1
2
3 to egg. Few minutes after the second dose there was a wheal of one
4
5
6 centimetre on the left lower side of the lip, a self-limiting rash down the
7
8
9 thighs, and also one loose stool. No cardiovascular or respiratory
10
11 involvement. The patient got an oral antihistamine, but that was mostly
12
13 because of a long travel home by car, and left the clinic one hour after the
14
15 second dose.
16
17

18
19
20 Two patients had possible reactions to the vaccine.
21

22
23 One 11 months old with severe ongoing eczema, and multiple food allergy
24
25 (milk, wheat, barley, oats, rye, fish, peanuts) SSIgE > 99kU/L, had never
26
27 been exposed to egg. The right ear was more erythematous, and a slight
28
29 swelling around the eye on the same side after the second dose. This reaction
30
31 was difficult to distinguish from the rest of his eczema symptoms that varies
32
33 a lot. No cardiovascular or respiratory involvement. The other patient was 8
34
35 years and 7 month old and had asthma, inhalation allergy (grass-pollen) and
36
37 food allergies (milk, fish). SSIgE 14.6 kU/L, and had never exposed to egg.
38
39 The patient started to sneeze after the second dose. There were no
40
41 cardiovascular involvement and no bronco-constriction when pulmonary
42
43 auscultation was done. The sneezing was self-limiting, and something that
44
45 happens on a regular basis at home, according to the parents.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 The reaction that took the longest time to resolve was a 16 year old, patient
60
with asthma, SSIgE >99 kU/L. There had been an earlier anaphylactic shock

1
2
3
4 to egg, the patient had been anxious before coming to the clinic, and had
5
6 skipped breakfast. The patient experienced abdominal pain after the first
7
8 fractioned dose. The patient had to lie down, was repeatedly examined, with
9
10 the conclusion of no allergic reaction. The vaccine is further fractioned 4
11
12 times, last dose was 6/10 of the dose. Total time spent at the outpatient clinic
13
14 is 3 hours, but the patient felt well when leaving the outpatient clinic. The
15
16 method used to get this patient vaccinated is more similar to the method
17
18 described in RED Book (13) with an extended fractioning of the dose. The
19
20 reason to vaccinate this patient with a multiple fractioning of the dose was
21
22 psychological symptoms disguising as allergic reactions. By taking it
23
24 stepwise in very small steps, the patient felt assured that there would be no
25
26 severe allergic reaction. If the patient had not been assured in this way, it
27
28 would have been uncomfortable for the patient, to the degree that it would
29
30 have been impossible to complete the vaccination.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 After this incident all the teenagers were asked if they had eaten breakfast
46
47 and those who had not, had to eat before getting vaccinated.
48
49
50

51 **Discussion**

52 Injecting a person with the intent of vaccination also brings the potential of
53
54 an adverse reaction. In this study there was one adverse reaction, and two
55
56 possible adverse reactions. All of the reactions were mild, with no need for
57
58 immediate intervention. The group being vaccinated in this study was a high-
59
60

1
2
3 risk group because of their egg allergy, and even more so when 79% of the
4 patients had other atopic diseases besides egg allergy. The approach taken in
5
6 this study shows it is possible to vaccinate egg allergic patients, even those
7
8 with anaphylaxis to egg and concurring atopic disease, with a regular
9
10 influenza-vaccine, that has less than 0.66 mg/ml Ovalbumin content.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 The findings of C. Kelly and V. Gangur that there is a sex disparity in food
18 allergic children under 18 years of age (14), which males predominates,
19
20 correlates well with our study group where 63% of the patients under 18 are
21
22 males.
23
24
25
26
27

28 Patients getting the vaccine fractioned had a higher prevalence of asthma,
29
30 than the ones getting the vaccine as a single dose. Asthma in patients with
31
32 food allergy increases the risk of anaphylaxis. (15) Respiratory involvement
33
34 was also one of the inclusion criterions for getting the vaccine fractioned,
35
36 this can explain the difference in asthma prevalence between the patients
37
38 getting the vaccine fractioned or as a single dose.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The NCHS data brief from 2008 (16.) showed that patients with food allergy
49
50 under the age of 18 years had an increased risk of other atopic diseases,
51
52 asthma 29,4 %, eczema 27,2% and inhalation allergies 31,5%. Our study
53
54 population had higher prevalence for all of these atopic diseases (asthma
55
56 49%, eczema 38%, inhalation allergy 31%, other food allergy 40%).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 demonstrating that our study population is a selected group more affected by
4
5
6 atopic disease than is to be expected, even among those allergic to egg.
7
8
9

10
11 The other studies that have looked at the safety of vaccinating with vaccine
12
13 containing egg residue, has not looked into the aspect of concurring other
14
15 atopic diseases. (17, 18, 19, 12)
16
17

18
19 Concurring atopic diseases is of concern when vaccinating, but we have
20
21 showed that even though our study population were more affected than
22
23 expected with concurring atopic disease, they could still be vaccinated.
24
25
26
27

28
29 The one patient with a definite reaction to the vaccine, and the two with
30
31 possible reactions to vaccine had never been exposed to egg. This warrant for
32
33 a cautious approach when vaccinating anyone tested positive for egg allergy,
34
35 but never have been exposed to egg. These patients should be treated as if
36
37 they had had severe reactions to egg exposure when vaccinating with a
38
39 vaccine containing egg residue.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 When handling patients with food allergies, one must be aware that the level
52
53 of SSIgE or size of SPT does not predict the severity of a food reaction. (20)
54
55

56
57 The patients in our study getting the vaccine fractioned have the most severe
58
59 allergic reactions to egg. Yet we find no difference in SSIgE levels between
60
the ones getting the vaccine fractioned or as a single dose. This finding

1
2
3 emphasize that the level of SSIgE should not determine whether the vaccine
4
5 should be fractioned or not.
6
7

8
9 This study shows that also patients with prior serious allergic reactions to
10
11 egg can be vaccinated using a fractioned vaccine approach. Every centre
12
13 giving vaccines are educated for the task in an event of an allergic reaction to
14
15 the vaccine. When vaccinating patients with prior anaphylactic reactions to
16
17 egg, it is important that the centre given the vaccine also have experience
18
19 with allergies. If not there will be an overestimation of allergic reactions, as
20
21 demonstrated by the fourth patient in our study.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The approach that were taken in this study can be used when there is a need
32
33 for mass vaccination, A simple questionnaire can replace the interview,
34
35 making the evaluation process simpler, and more effective in a mass
36
37 vaccination setting.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Acknowledgements:**

50 I would like to thank my colleagues Roald Bolle MD and Martin Sørensen
51
52 MD at the outpatient clinic for their help in doing this study, and Marit
53
54 Leonardsen RN for coordinating everything. I would like to thank Signe
55
56 Forsdahl for helping me with the manuscript.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Bård Anders Forsdahl has the right to grant, and does grant, an exclusive
4
5
6 licence on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and its
7
8
9 licensees, to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in BMJ editions
10
11
12 and any other BMJPG products and to exploit all subsidiary rights as set out
13
14
15 in our license.

16 17 18 19 20 **Competing interests**

21 Bård Anders Forsdahl has completed the Unified Competing Interest form and declare
22 that BAF has no relationship with any company for the submitted work. BAF has no
23 relationship with any company that might have an interest in the submitted work in the
24 previous 3 years. The wife of BAF, partners or children has no financial relationships that
25 may be relevant to the submitted work. BAF has no non-financial interest that may be
26 relevant to the submitted work.
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Funding**

33 There is no study sponsor and Bård Anders Forsdahl has received no funding
34 for this manuscript.
35
36
37
38

39 **Contributorship**

40 There are no other contributors to this article.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. World Health organization weekly epidemiological record. No 30, 2009, 84, 301-308
2. The Norwegian health authorities updated webpage October 23 2009.
http://www.pandemi.no/pandemi/aktuelt/statusrapporter/ kt_influenasaaktivitet_og_ny_va ksineanbefaling_609974
3. The WHO webpage.
http://www.who.int/csr/disease/swineflu/frequently_asked_questions/vaccine_preparedne ss/use/en/index.html
4. ACDC webpage.
http://www.cdc.gov/h1n1flu/vaccination/vaccine_safety_qa.htm#c
5. American Academy of Pediatrics. Influenza. In: Pickering LK, ed. Red Book 2009 Report of the committee on infectious disease. 28 ed. Elk Grove Village, IL: American Academy of pediatrics 2009:400-12
6. The Norwegian health authorities updated webpage December 4 2009.
http://www.pandemi.no/pandemi/aktuelt/vaksine_til_personer_med_alvorlig_eggallergi_e r_kommet_647414
7. The Norwegian health authorities updated webpage October 28 2009.
http://www.fhi.no/eway/default.aspx?pid=233&trg=MainLeft_5565&MainArea_5661=55 65:0:15,5034:1:0:0:::0:0&MainLeft_5565=5544:80779::1:5569:6:::0:0
8. Erlewyn-Lajeunesse M, Braathwaite N, Lucas JSA, Warner JO. Recommendations for the administration of influenza vaccine in children allergic to egg. *BMJ* 2009;**339**:b3680 page 912-5
9. Personal correspondance Hilde Bakken Glaxo Smith Kline October 2009.
10. The Norwegian health authorities updated webpage December 15 2009.
http://www.pandemi.no/pandemi/vaksinerings/ n_dose_pandemrix_tilstrekkelig_for_de_fl este_barn_og_voksne_651064
11. Personal correspondance with Ann Karin Lien, Immunology lab University Hospital North Norway March 10 2011.
12. James JM, Zeiger RS, Lester MR, Fasano MB, Gern JE, Mansfield LE, et al. Safe administration of influenza vaccine to patients with egg allergy. *J Pediatr* 1998;**133**:624-8
13. Committee on Infectious Diseases, American Academy of Pediatrics. Active immunization. In: Pickering LK, Baker CJ, Long SS, Mcmillan JA, eds. Red Book: report of the committee of infectious diseases. 27th ed. Elk Grove Village, IL: American Academy of pediatrics 2006:9-54
14. Kelly C, Gangur V. Sex disparity in food allergy: Evidence from the Pubmed database. *J Allergy (Cairo)*. 2009;2009:159845. Epub 2009 Jul 2
15. Wüthrich B, Ballmer-Weber BK. Food-induced anaphylaxis. *Allergy*. 2001; 56 Suppl 67:121-4
16. Branum AM, Lukacs SL. Food allergy among U.S. children: Trends in prevalence and hospitalizations. NCHS data brief, no 10. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics. 2008
17. Chung EY, Huang L, Schneider L. Safety of influenza vaccine administration in egg-allergic patients. *Pediatrics*. 2010 May; **125(5)**:e1024-30. Epub 2010 Apr 5.
18. Gagnon R, Primeau MN, Des Roches A, Lemire C, Kagan R, Carr S, Ouakki M, Benoit M, De Serres G; PHAQ-CIHR Influenza Research Network. Safe vaccination of patients with egg allergy with an adjuvanted pandemic H1N1 vaccine. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2010 Aug; **126(2)**:317-23. Epub Jun 25.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

19. Greenhawt MJ, Chernin AS, Howe L, Li JT, Sanders G. The safety of the H1N1 influenza a vaccine in egg allergic individuals. *ANN Allergy Asthma Immunol.* 2010 Nov;**105(5)**:387-93.

20. Sicherer SH, Morrow EH, Sampson HA. Dose-response in double-blind, placebo-controlled oral food challenges in children with atopic dermatitis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2000 Mar;**105(3)**:582-6.

For peer review only

STROBE 2007 (v4) checklist of items to be included in reports of observational studies in epidemiology*
Checklist for cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies (combined)

| Section/Topic | Item # | Recommendation | Reported on page # |
|---------------------------|--------|--|--------------------|
| Title and abstract | 1 | (a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract | |
| | | (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found | 3 |
| Introduction | | | |
| Background/rationale | 2 | Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported | 3-5 |
| Objectives | 3 | State specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses | 3-5 |
| Methods | | | |
| Study design | 4 | Present key elements of study design early in the paper | 5 |
| Setting | 5 | Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection | 5 |
| Participants | 6 | (a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants | 5 |
| | | (b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case | - |
| Variables | 7 | Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable | |
| Data sources/ measurement | 8* | For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group | 5 |
| Bias | 9 | Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias | - |
| Study size | 10 | Explain how the study size was arrived at | 5 |
| Quantitative variables | 11 | Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why | - |
| Statistical methods | 12 | (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding | - |
| | | (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions | - |
| | | (c) Explain how missing data were addressed | - |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|---|---------|
| | | (d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy | - |
| | | (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses | - |
| Results | | | |
| Participants | 13* | (a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed | 8 |
| | | (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage | 8 |
| | | (c) Consider use of a flow diagram | - |
| Descriptive data | 14* | (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders | 8 |
| | | (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest | 9 |
| | | (c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) | 5 |
| Outcome data | 15* | <i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time | 9-10-11 |
| | | <i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure | - |
| | | <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures | - |
| Main results | 16 | (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included | 10 |
| | | (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized | - |
| | | (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period | - |
| Other analyses | 17 | Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses | - |
| Discussion | | | |
| Key results | 18 | Summarise key results with reference to study objectives | 13 |
| Limitations | 19 | Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias | - |
| Interpretation | 20 | Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence | 16 |
| Generalisability | 21 | Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results | 16 |
| Other information | | | |
| Funding | 22 | Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based | 17 |

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

1
2 **Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE
3 checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at
4 <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

For peer review only



**Reactions of Norwegian Children With Severe Egg Allergy to
an Egg-Containing Influenza A (H1N1) Vaccine – a
Retrospective Audit.**

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | bmjopen-2011-000186.R1 |
| Article Type: | Research |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 28-Jul-2011 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Forsdahl, Bård; University Hospital of North Norway, Pediatrics |
| Primary Subject Heading: | Paediatrics |
| Secondary Subject Heading: | |
| Keywords: | Paediatric infectious disease & immunisation < PAEDIATRICS, IMMUNOLOGY, Change management < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 bmjopen-2011-000168 revision 1
4
5
6

7 **Reactions of Norwegian Children With Severe Egg Allergy to an Egg-**
8 **Containing Influenza A (H1N1) Vaccine – a Retrospective Audit.**
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 Bård Anders Forsdahl, MD.

18 For the moment on a sabbatical at:

19 Center for Excellence in Pulmonary Biology

20 Divisions of Pulmonary, Asthma, and Critical Care Medicine

21 Lucille Salter Packard Children`s Hospital at Stanford

22 770 Welch Road, Suite 350

23 Palo Alto, CA 94306

24 USA

25 Tel: +1-(650) 630-9230

26 Fax: +1 (650) 723-5201

27 E-mail: forsdahl@c2i.net
28
29
30
31
32

33 Department of Pediatrics

34 University Hospital of North Norway

35 Tromsø

36 Norway
37
38
39
40

41 Keywords: Vaccination, Egg Allergic, Influenza Vaccine,

42
43 Word count body (included abstract, tables and references) : 4450

44
45 Word count abstract: 222

46
47 Word count References: 394

48
49 Number of tables: 1

50
51 Number of figures: 0
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Article summary

Article focus:

- We wanted to vaccinate the children severely affected by egg allergy with the same vaccine that the rest of the Norwegian population, was receiving at the time, and that vaccine contained egg residue.

Key message:

- It is safe to vaccinated children with severe egg allergy with a vaccine containing a low level of egg residue – even if these children suffer from concurrent atopic diseases.

- The level of serum specific IgE to egg does not predict a reaction to the vaccine.

- Children with a positive serum-specific IgE test to egg allergy who had never been exposed to egg, should be treated as if they are allergic to egg.

Strengths and limitations of this study:

- The strength of this study is that it is the same doctor who thoroughly evaluated all the patients before vaccination also evaluated the patients with suspected reactions to the vaccine.

- A weakness is that the number of participants in the study is quite small.

Abstract

Location of study The outpatient clinic of the Department of Pediatrics at the University Hospital of North Norway in Tromsø, Norway.

Background In July 2009, the World Health Organisation recommended vaccination against the emerging pandemic influenza A(H1N1) virus. In October of the same year, the Norwegian Health Authorities (NHA) followed suit by recommending vaccination of the whole Norwegian population. For subjects with egg allergy this posed a problem as the only vaccine available in Norway until 4 December 4 2009 contained egg protein. It was decided at our clinic that children allergic to egg should be given the vaccine, but in a strictly controlled environment.

Study participants Eighty children and adolescents with egg allergy were vaccinated with Pandemrix, a monovalent vaccine against influenza A(H1N1). Sixty-three of these patients (79%) had one or more other atopic diseases apart from egg allergy. Forty-two patients (52%) were given the vaccine as a single dose. The remainder received one-tenth of the dose followed 30 minutes later by nine-tenths. The vaccine used had an ovalbumin content $<0.333 \mu\text{g/ml}$. There were no serious adverse reactions. Only one child displayed a definite but mild reaction, while two exhibited symptoms that may or may not have been caused by the vaccine.

Conclusion This study indicates that it is safe to vaccinate children even if the suffer from severe egg allergy.

Ethical aspects

We obtained the written consent of the parents of the case histories presented in this article.

We did not obtain approval for the study from the Regional Committee for Research Ethics in Northern Norway before commencing the vaccination drive, but we applied for approval in November 2010. The Committee responded that it considered the vaccination drive as ‘part of ordinary treatment’, even though it could have been experimental, and that the project therefore fell outside its mandate. However, it added that we as the applicants had the right to ‘publish the treatment’.

Introduction

In July 2009, the World Health Organisation (WHO) recommended vaccination against the emerging pandemic Influenza A (H1N1) virus.¹ In October 2009 The Norwegian Health Authorities (NHA) followed suit and recommended vaccination of the whole Norwegian population against the virus.²

However, the available monovalent influenza A(H1N1) vaccine at the time contained egg-protein (ovalbumin) residue and the WHO, American Center for Disease Control (CDC) and American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) all

1
2
3 warned that it should not be used in patients with severe egg allergy.^{3,4,5} An
4
5
6 egg-free vaccine was expected, but would not be available in Norway before
7
8
9 the first week of December 2009 and then only in a very limited number of
10
11
12 doses.⁶

13
14 An NHA appointed advisory group recommended that patients with egg
15
16
17 allergy should be examined by a physician with a special competence in
18
19
20 allergies and that patients with anaphylactic shock reactions to egg should not
21
22
23 be vaccinated at all.⁷ In addition, it was recommended that patients who
24
25
26 exhibit a severe reaction to egg should be subjected to a skin prick test to
27
28
29 determine whether or not the individual could be safely vaccinated. The
30
31
32 advisory group regarded one or more of the following reactions to egg as
33
34
35 severe: , angioedema, airway oedema, asthma, urticaria, rhinitis or vomiting.
36
37 The pediatric outpatient clinic at the University Hospital North Norway sees
38
39
40 about 6000 consultations per year, and approximately half of these
41
42
43 consultations concern atopic diseases. In October 2009 Erlewyn-Lajeunesse et
44
45
46 al. recommended that patients allergic to egg should receive only vaccines
47
48
49 containing <1.2 µg/ml ovalbumin, and that a two-dose split protocol should
50
51
52 be used in individuals with severe egg allergy.⁸ According to the producer, the
53
54
55 available monovalent Influenza A H1N1 vaccine contained <0.333 µg/ml
56
57
58 ovalbumin.⁹

59 We decided to vaccinate children and adolescents allergic to egg with the
60
recommendations by Erlewyn-Lajeunesse et al.⁸ The only patients to be

1
2
3 vaccinated at the outpatient clinic were those unable to digest the slightest
4 amount of egg, including egg-containing baked goods. Originally the
5
6 amount of egg, including egg-containing baked goods. Originally the
7
8 recommendation from the NHA was that the patients should receive two
9
10 doses of the vaccine. However before we could administer the second dose,
11
12 new information from the NHA became available in December 2009 ,
13
14 indicating that one dose of the vaccine produced a sufficient immune
15
16 response.¹⁰
17
18
19
20
21

22 The objective of this study was to determine the safety of administering a
23
24 monovalent Influenza A H1N1 vaccine to egg allergic patients following the
25
26 guidelines in the article.⁸
27
28
29
30

31 **Method and material**

32
33 Setting The vaccination drive took place at the outpatient clinic of the
34
35 Department of Pediatrics at the University Hospital of North Norway in
36
37 Tromsø, Norway. Vaccinations were administered from 4 November to 1
38
39 December 2009.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Study participants** A total of 80 children were vaccinated: 50 (62.5%) boys
48
49 and 30 (37.5%) girls. Mean age was six years and three months. Some of the
50
51 patients were under our care while others had been referred to us for
52
53 vaccination by their general practitioner.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Criteria for inclusion in the study** There were two criteria and both had to
4
5
6 be met. The first criterion was a diagnosed sensitisation to egg demonstrated
7
8
9 by a positive skin prick test (SPT) or positive serum analysis for specific IgE-
10
11
12 (SSIgE-) mediated egg allergy. The SPT was considered positive if a wheal of
13
14 more than 3 mm formed; the SSIgE was analysed with either the Siemens
15
16 Immulite® or the Phadia ImmunoCAP®.¹¹ Values >0.35 kU/L were
17
18 considered positive.
19
20

21
22
23 The second criterion was that the patient had to be on an egg-free diet and be
24
25 unable to eat any food containing any amount of egg, including egg-
26
27 containing baked goods, without an allergic reaction to egg protein. We also
28
29 included patients who were sensitised to egg but had never been exposed to
30
31 egg or egg containing baked goods and were on an egg-free diet.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Concurrent atopic diseases** We recorded other atopic diseases in the
40
41 included patients only if they were on current medication for asthma, allergy
42
43 or eczema or if they were on a diet that avoided food other than egg. The
44
45 other atopic diseases had been diagnosed by a physician prior to vaccination.
46
47
48
49 No other diseases than atopic diseases were recorded.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **Course of action** An appointment was made for all patients at the outpatient
57
58 clinic. Every day, one nurse was assigned to administer the vaccine. The same
59
60 physician (BF) conducted all interviews, examinations and evaluations for all

1
2
3 patients, and decided whether they should receive a fractionated or a single-
4
5
6 dose vaccine. All patients were interviewed and physically examined. A form
7
8
9 that contained written instructions on which type of vaccination the patient
10
11
12 should receive, was completed. Included on the form was the dosage of
13
14
15 intramuscular adrenaline, intravenous hydrocortisone and oral antihistamine
16
17
18 to be administered in case of a severe allergic reaction.

19
20
21
22 All the asthmatics on the programme were in a stable phase and all patients
23
24
25 could be vaccinated. Two of the children had a very severe atopic eczema at
26
27
28 the time of vaccination; one of them was an inpatient as a result of severe
29
30
31 eczema. If any reaction to the vaccine occurred while a patient was at the
32
33
34 outpatient clinic, it would be recorded by the nurse and the patient would be
35
36
37 examined by the same doctor who had conducted the initial assessment.

38
39 Every reaction except pain at the injection site was recorded.
40
41

42
43
44 We adopted the approach advised in the case of mass vaccination and took no
45
46
47 new blood samples for the purpose of diagnosing allergy, relying on the
48
49
50 available information.
51

52
53 **Dose and administration** The vaccine dose was age dependent, 0.25 ml for
54
55
56 those under 10 years of age, and 0.5 ml for those over 10 years.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The enrolled patients were divided into two groups as described by Erlewyn-
4 Lajeunesse et al.⁸ One group was given fractionated doses of the vaccine:
5
6 first a tenth and after 30 minutes the remaining nine-tenths of the dose. The
7
8 other group got the vaccine as a single dose.
9

10
11
12 The criterion, which determined whether a patient should receive the
13
14 fractionated dose, was that he or she must have suffered from prior
15
16 anaphylaxis, cardiovascular complications or collapse when exposed to egg
17
18 protein. This included respiratory symptoms, hypotension, circulatory shock
19
20 and severe abdominal pain.
21
22

23
24
25 The criterion which determined whether a patient should receive the single
26
27 dose was that he or she should have suffered from mild gastrointestinal and
28
29 dermatological reactions when exposed to egg protein, including urticaria,
30
31 angioedema and vomiting.
32
33

34
35
36 One of the recommendations in the article was not followed.⁸ The article
37
38 recommended that patients with a known allergy to egg, but who had never
39
40 been exposed to egg in any form should get the vaccine as a single dose at the
41
42 hospital. Because the reaction of these patients to egg was unknown it was
43
44 decided to vaccinate them with a fractionated dose.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54
55
56 The patients waited 30 minutes between the fractionated doses, and 60
57
58 minutes after the final fractionated dose. The patients who received a single
59
60 dose waited 30 minutes before they left the clinic. The patients and parents

1
2
3 were encouraged to provide us with feedback should a patient experience a
4
5
6 delayed allergic reaction after returning home.
7

8
9 All patients and parents were informed that the NHA had discouraged using
10
11 this particular vaccine in individuals with egg allergy, but that there was
12
13 reason to believe they could still be vaccinated, and that some published
14
15 articles agreed.⁸ They were also informed that the vaccine was administered
16
17 at the outpatient clinic in case of an adverse reaction. Both patients and
18
19 parents expressed their confidence in the treatment and information they were
20
21 given.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Statistical analysis**

34
35 We used Wilcoxon Rank Sum test, , Chi square and Student t-test to test for
36
37 statistical significance. A p-value <0,05 was considered significant.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Results**

46 **Study population** A total of 80 (100%)patients (50 boys and 30 girls) were
47
48 enrolled, and were all vaccinated. Mean age was 6,25 years, ranging from 10
49
50 months to 16,5years. Mean age of those getting the vaccine fractioned was 6
51
52 years 9 months, and those getting single dose vaccine were 6 years 3 months.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Number (N) of vaccinated patients, mode of vaccination, age range and mean, % with concurring atopic diseases in addition to allergy to egg, serum-specific IgE range and median, according to allergic reaction to egg.

| Allergic reaction to egg. | Number of patients (%) | Mode of vaccination | Age in months range (mean) | Atopy (%) | Asthma (%) | Food allergy (%) | Inhalation allergy (%) | Eczema (%) | SSiGE kU/L range | SSiGE kU/l median |
|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|------------|------------------|------------------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Serious reaction to egg. | 19 (24%) | Fractionated vaccine dose | 29-198 (95) | 16 (84%) | 11 (58%) | 5 (26%) | 7 (37%) | 9 (47%) | 1,0->99 | 12,8 |
| Never exposed to egg. | 19 (24%) | Fractionated vaccine dose | 10-120 (55) | 16 (84%) | 11 (58%) | 10 (53%) | 5 (26%) | 11 (58%) | 1,7-99 | 20,4 |
| Mild reaction to egg. | 42 (52%) | Single vaccine dose | 11-193 (75) | 31 (74%) | 17 (40%) | 17 (40%) | 12 (29%) | 18 (43%) | 0,8->99 | 22,9 |
| Total | 80 (100%) | | 10-198 (75) | 63 (79%) | 39 (49%) | 32 (40%) | 24 (30%) | 38 (48%) | 0,8->99 | 17,0 |

The criterion for **serious allergic reaction** to egg was that the patient must have suffered from prior anaphylaxis, cardiovascular complications or collapse. This includes respiratory symptoms, hypotension and circulatory shock, and severe abdominal pain when exposed to egg or egg-containing baked goods.

- **Never exposed to egg** means the parents stated that the kids had never been exposed to egg or egg-containing baked goods.
- The criteria for **mild allergic reaction** to egg were prior mild gastrointestinal and dermatological reactions, including urticaria, angioedema and vomiting when exposed to egg or egg-containing baked goods.
- Food allergy refers to a diagnosed food allergy apart from egg allergy.
- SSiGE refers to serum-specific IgE to egg protein.

A total of 73 patients (91%) had a positive SSiGE test, although we did not know the exact value of the SSiGE test of two of them. The remaining seven (9%) had shown a reaction to egg in only the skin prick. Median SSiGE level to egg-protein, for the whole group, was 17.0 kU/L. Eleven (15%) patients had an SSiGE >99 kU/L, while 25 (35%) patients had an SSiGE between $0.8 \leq 8.3$ kU/L.

1
2
3 Of the 80 patients, 38 (48%) were given the fractionated dose and 42 (52%)
4
5
6 received the vaccine as a single dose. There is a statistical difference in age
7
8
9 between the patients never being exposed to egg, and those having a severe
10
11
12 allergic reaction to egg. The groups were indistinguishable with regard to
13
14
15 SSIgE level and time since the SSIgE level had been done. There was also no
16
17
18 difference in the median and the range of SSIgE between the two groups.
19
20
21 SSIgE had been measured between one month and 10 years before, with a
22
23
24 mean time 28.6 months. Half of the patients who had their SSIgE measured
25
26
27 were older than one year, and the SSIgE had a median value of 25.4 kU/L.

28
29
30
31 A surprisingly high number of patients -19 (24%) - had according to their
32
33
34 parents, never been exposed to egg. These patients had for some reason been
35
36
37 tested for egg allergy, the tests had shown elevated SSIgE to egg protein, and
38
39
40 consequently they had avoided egg thereafter. The testing took place before
41
42
43 they had an opportunity to be exposed to egg. At our clinic, patients with
44
45
46 suspicious allergies to other foods or a severe atopic eczema will routinely be
47
48
49 tested for food allergies, including egg allergy.

50
51
52 A high number of patients - 63 (79%) - had atopic diseases other than those
53
54
55 caused by egg allergy and 39 (49%) patients were on treatment for asthma. A
56
57
58 total of 38 (48%) patients suffered from ongoing eczema.

59
60
There were 43 (54%) patients with other allergies apart from egg allergy,
including food and inhalation allergies. All in all, these 43 patients suffered

1
2
3 from a total of 134 recorded allergies. Food allergies were the most common
4
5 (32 (40%) patients), while 24 (30%) of the patients presented with an
6
7 inhalation allergy.
8
9

10
11 There are no statistical significant differences between the groups never
12
13 being exposed to egg, a severe allergy to egg or a mild allergy to egg,
14
15 regarding atopy, asthma, food allergies other than egg allergy, inhalation
16
17 allergies or eczema.
18
19
20
21

22
23
24
25 **Responses to the vaccine** All patients and their parents were encouraged to
26
27 contact the outpatient clinic after the vaccination if a delayed allergic reaction
28
29 occurred, but nobody reported any such reaction.
30
31
32

33
34
35
36 Of the 80 patients enrolled in the programme, only four displayed symptoms
37
38 shortly after vaccination. Their histories and reactions are discussed below.
39
40
41

42
43
44 Patient A (2 years 8 months old) This patient had a mild allergic reaction to
45
46 the vaccine. The vaccine was given as a fractionated dose. The SSiGE
47
48 (measured in the month before vaccination) was 1.7 kU/L and the patient had
49
50 never before been exposed to egg. The patient had also been diagnosed with
51
52 asthma and food allergies to milk, fish, peas and peanuts. A few minutes after
53
54 the second dose the patient displayed a wheal of one centimetre on the left
55
56 side of the lower lip, a self-limiting rash on the thighs and also one loose
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 stool. No cardiovascular or respiratory reaction was experienced. The patient
4
5
6 was given an oral antihistamine – mainly because the travelling time home
7
8
9 would be long – and left the clinic one hour after the second dose.
10

11
12
13
14 **Patient B** (11 months old) This patient also received a fractionated dose and
15
16
17 showed symptoms that could perhaps be attributed to the vaccine. The patient
18
19
20 had never before been exposed to egg and had and SSIgE >99kU/L, tested in
21
22
23 the month before vaccination. The patient suffered from severe ongoing
24
25
26 eczema and multiple food allergies (milk, wheat, barley, oats, rye, fish,
27
28
29 peanuts). After the first dose the right ear was more erythematous, and after
30
31
32 the second dose a slight swelling developed around the eye on the same side.
33
34
35 It was difficult to distinguish this response from the other eczema symptoms
36
37
38 as they vary significantly. The patient displayed no cardiovascular or
39
40
41 respiratory reaction.
42

43
44
45 **Patient C** (8 years and 7 months old) This patient showed symptoms that
46
47
48 could perhaps be as a result of the vaccine. The last SSIgE value (measured
49
50
51 three years before vaccination) had been 14.6 kU/L and the patient had never
52
53
54 been exposed to egg. The last SPT was done 10 months prior to vaccination,
55
56
57 and was positive with a wheal of 10 millimetres. The patient had also been
58
59
60 diagnosed with asthma, inhalation allergy (grass pollen) and food allergies
(milk, fish), was given a fractionated dose and started to sneeze after the

1
2
3 second dose. There were no cardiovascular symptoms and pulmonary
4
5 auscultation also showed no bronchoconstriction. The sneezing was self-
6
7 limiting and happens regularly at home, according to the parents.
8
9

10
11
12 **Patient D** (16 years old) This reaction took the longest to resolve, but the
13
14 symptoms were eventually attributed to fear of being exposed to an egg-
15
16 containing vaccine as the patient had previously had an anaphylactic reaction
17
18 to egg-containing food. The patient had also been diagnosed with asthma and
19
20 had an SSIgE >99 kU/L, measured in the month before vaccination. The
21
22 patient had been anxious before coming to the clinic and had skipped
23
24 breakfast. The patient experienced abdominal pain after the first fractionated
25
26 dose, and had to lie down and was repeatedly examined, and the conclusion
27
28 was that there was no allergic reaction. The vaccine was further fractionated
29
30 four times and the last administration was six-tenths of the dose. Total time
31
32 spent at the outpatient clinic was three hours, but the patient felt fit when
33
34 leaving. The method used to vaccinate this patient (extended fractionating) is
35
36 similar to the extended-fractionating method described in the AAP Committee
37
38 on Infectious Disease's Red Book.¹³ We decided on multiple fractionating for
39
40 this patient because the psychological symptoms could have masqueraded as
41
42 allergic reactions. By administering the vaccine in very small steps, the
43
44 patient felt reassured that there would be no severe allergic reaction. Without
45
46 such reassurance the vaccination might have become so uncomfortable for the
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 patient that it could have become impossible to complete.
4
5
6
7

8
9 After this incident all the teenagers were asked if they had had breakfast and
10
11 those who did not had to eat before being vaccinated.
12
13

14 15 16 **Discussion and conclusions**

17 Of the patients who participated in this study, one showed a clear adverse
18
19 reaction to the egg-containing vaccine and two had a possible adverse
20
21 reaction. All reactions were mild and needed no immediate intervention.
22
23

24
25 Because they had an egg allergy, all the patients in the group were considered
26
27 at high risk, even more so because 79% of them suffered from other atopic
28
29 diseases as well.
30
31
32

33
34
35
36 **Safety of vaccination in patients allergic to egg** The study confirmed that
37
38 patients allergic to egg can be safely vaccinated with a regular influenza
39
40 vaccine containing $< 0.333 \mu\text{g/ml}$ ovalbumin, even if these patients had
41
42 displayed previous anaphylactic reactions to egg and had been diagnosed with
43
44 concurrent atopic diseases. By following the guidelines in the article, we were
45
46 able to vaccinate the patients allergic to egg.⁸ If future influenza vaccines
47
48 were to contain considerably larger amount of ovalbumin, we would consider
49
50 using the same guidelines as in this study.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **Significance of concurrent atopic diseases** According to the 2008 data brief
5
6 by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), individuals who are
7
8 under 18 years of age and suffer from food allergy, have an increased risk of
9
10 other atopic diseases.¹⁴ The increased risk is 29.4% for asthma, 27.2% for
11
12 eczema and 31.5% for inhalation allergies. Our study population had a higher
13
14 prevalence of all these atopic diseases (asthma 49%, eczema 48%, inhalation
15
16 allergy 30%, other food allergy 40%) – in other words, they were more
17
18 affected by atopic disease than is to be expected, even in individuals allergic
19
20 to egg.
21
22

23
24
25
26
27
28 Other studies investigating the safety of vaccinating with products that
29
30 contain egg residue have not considered the aspect of other concurrent atopic
31
32 diseases.^{15, 16, 17, 12} Concurrent atopic diseases are of concern in vaccination,
33
34 but we showed that even though our study population was affected more
35
36 heavily than one would expect, these patients could still be safely vaccinated.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44
45 **Significance of no previous exposure to egg** The patient with an allergic
46
47 reaction to the vaccine and the two patients with possible reactions had never
48
49 before been exposed to egg. This could indicate that a cautious approach is
50
51 needed in the vaccination of individuals who had tested positive for egg
52
53 allergy but had never been exposed to egg. When immunised with an egg-
54
55 containing vaccine, these patients should be treated as if they had in fact
56
57 exhibited a reaction to egg exposure.
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Significance of SSiGE/SPT** Practitioners treating patients with food allergies
4
5
6 should be aware that the level of SSiGE or size of SPT does not predict the
7
8 severity of a food reaction.¹⁸ The patients in our study who were given the
9
10 fractionated-dose vaccine had displayed the most severe allergic reactions to
11
12 egg. Yet we found no difference in SSiGE levels of those who received the
13
14 fractionated dose and those who received the vaccine as a single dose. This
15
16 finding emphasizes that SSiGE levels should not determine whether the
17
18 vaccine should be fractionated or not.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Significance of age** There was a significant age difference between the
29
30 patients who had never been exposed to egg, and those with a severe reaction
31
32 to egg. We believe the reason for this is that it is difficult to keep children on
33
34 an egg free diet. The moment they are exposed to egg, they are relegated to
35
36 put in one of the two other groups, with a known allergic reaction to egg.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Dose fractionation** In this study we chose to vaccinate either with a
46
47 fractionated or a single dose. All patients tolerated the 10% dose, and
48
49 ultimately received the 90% dose, and only one patient showed a mild
50
51 reaction. This indicates that in the case of a vaccine with an ovalbumin level
52
53 of $<0.333 \mu\text{g/ml}$, all patients could in fact have received the vaccine as a
54
55 single dose without serious complications.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Risk of overestimating allergic reactions** Every centre administering
4 vaccines knows the protocols that should be followed in the event of an
5
6 allergic reaction to a vaccine. When patients with prior anaphylactic reactions
7
8
9 to egg are vaccinated, it is important that the centre administering the vaccine
10
11
12 also has experience of allergies. If not, allergic reactions could be
13
14
15 overestimated as a result of misinterpretation of symptoms, as could have
16
17
18 been the case with patient D in our study.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Acknowledgements:**

28
29 I would like to thank my colleagues Roald Bolle MD and Martin Sørensen
30
31 MD at the outpatient clinic at the University Hospital of North Norway for
32
33 their help in conducting this study, as well as Marit Leonardsen RN for
34
35 coordinating the study. My thanks also to Signe Forsdahl for helping me with
36
37 the manuscript.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Bård Anders Forsdahl has the right to grant, and does grant, an exclusive
47
48 licence on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and its
49
50 licensees, to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in BMJ editions
51
52 and any other BMJPG products and to exploit all subsidiary rights as set out
53
54
55 in our license.
56
57
58
59
60

Competing interests

Bård Anders Forsdahl has completed the Unified Competing Interest form and declare that BAF has no relationship with any company for the submitted work. BAF has no relationship with any company that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years. The wife of BAF, partners or children has no financial relationships that may be relevant to the submitted work. BAF has no non-financial interest that may be relevant to the submitted work.

Funding

There is no study sponsor and Bård Anders Forsdahl has received no funding for this manuscript.

Contributorship

There are no other contributors to this article.

References

1. World Health Organization Human infection with pandemic A(H1N1) 2009 influenza virus: clinical observations in hospitalized patients, Americas. *Weekly Epidemiological Record*. 2009, 84(30):301-308.
2. Norwegian Health Authorities. Økt influensaaktivitet og ny vaksineanbefaling, 23 October 2009.
http://www.pandemi.no/pandemi/aktuelt/statusrapporter/kt_influensaaktivitet_og_ny_vaksineanbefaling_609974
3. World Health Organisation. Use of the pandemic (H1N1) 2009 vaccines.
http://www.who.int/csr/disease/swineflu/frequently_asked_questions/vaccine_preparedness/use/en/index.html
4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. General questions and answers on 2009 H1N1 influenza vaccine safety.
http://www.cdc.gov/h1n1flu/vaccination/vaccine_safety_qa.htm#c
5. American Academy of Pediatrics. Influenza. In: Pickering LK, Baker CJ, Kimberlin DW, Long SS, eds. *Red Book: 2009 Report of the Committee on Infectious Diseases*. 28th ed. Elk Grove Village, IL: American Academy of Pediatrics; 2009:400-12
6. The Norwegian health authorities updated webpage December 4 2009.
http://www.pandemi.no/pandemi/aktuelt/vaksine_til_personer_med_alvorlig_eggallergi_er_kommet_647414

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

7. The Norwegian Health Authorities 28 October 2009.

[http://www.fhi.no/eway/default.aspx?pid=233&trg=MainLeft_5565&MainAr
ea_5661=5565:0:15,5034:1:0:0:::0:0&MainLeft_5565=5544:80779::1:5569:6
:::0:0](http://www.fhi.no/eway/default.aspx?pid=233&trg=MainLeft_5565&MainAr
ea_5661=5565:0:15,5034:1:0:0:::0:0&MainLeft_5565=5544:80779::1:5569:6
:::0:0)

8. Erlewyn-Lajeunesse M, Brathwaite N, Lucas JSA, Warner JO.

Recommendations for the administration of influenza vaccine in children
allergic to egg. *BMJ* 2009;**339**: 912-5

9 Personal correspondence with Hilde Bakke, regulatory advisor at
GlaxoSmithKline Norway, July 2011.

11. Personal correspondance with Ann Karin Lien, Immunology lab
University Hospital North Norway March 10 2011.

12. James JM, Zeiger RS, Lester MR, Fasano MB, Gern JE, Mansfield LE, et
al. Safe administration of influenza vaccine to patients with egg allergy. *J
Pediatr* 1998;**133**:624-813. American Academy of Pediatrics. Active
immunization. In: Pickering LK, Baker CJ, Long SS, McMillan JA, eds. *Red
Book: 2006 Report of the Committee of Infectious Diseases*. 27th ed. Elk
Grove Village, IL: American Academy of pediatrics; 2006:9-54

14. Branum AM, Lukacs SL. Food allergy among U.S. children: Trends in
prevalence and hospitalizations. NCHS data brief, no 10. Hyattsville, MD:
National Center for Health Statistics. 2008

- 1
2
3
4 15. Chung EY, Huang L, Schneider L. Safety of influenza vaccine
5
6 administration in egg-allergic patients. *Pediatrics*. 2010 May; **125(5)**:e1024-
7
8 30. Epub 2010 Apr 5.
- 9
10
11 16. Gagnon R, Primeau MN, Des Roches A, Lemire C, Kagan R, Carr S,
12
13 Ouakki M, Benoit M, De Serres G; PHAQ-CIHR Influenza Research
14
15 Network. Safe vaccination of patients with egg allergy with an adjuvanted
16
17 pandemic H1N1 vaccine. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2010 Aug; **126(2)**:317-23.
18
19 Epub Jun 25.
- 20
21
22 17. Greenhawt MJ, Chernin AS, Howe L, Li JT, Sanders G. The safety of the
23
24 H1N1 influenza a vaccine in egg allergic individuals. *ANN Allergy Asthma*
25
26 *Immunol*. 2010 Nov; **105(5)**:387-93.
- 27
28
29 18. Sicherer SH, Morrow EH, Sampson HA. Dose-response in double-blind,
30
31 placebo-controlled oral food challenges in children with atopic dermatitis. *J*
32
33 *Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2000 Mar; **105(3)**:582-6.
- 34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STROBE 2007 (v4) checklist of items to be included in reports of observational studies in epidemiology*
Checklist for cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies (combined)

| Section/Topic | Item # | Recommendation | Reported on page # |
|---------------------------|--------|--|--------------------|
| Title and abstract | 1 | (a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract | |
| | | (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found | 3 |
| Introduction | | | |
| Background/rationale | 2 | Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported | 3-5 |
| Objectives | 3 | State specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses | 3-5 |
| Methods | | | |
| Study design | 4 | Present key elements of study design early in the paper | 5 |
| Setting | 5 | Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection | 5 |
| Participants | 6 | (a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants | 5 |
| | | (b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case | - |
| Variables | 7 | Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable | |
| Data sources/ measurement | 8* | For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group | 5 |
| Bias | 9 | Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias | - |
| Study size | 10 | Explain how the study size was arrived at | 5 |
| Quantitative variables | 11 | Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why | - |
| Statistical methods | 12 | (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding | - |
| | | (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions | - |
| | | (c) Explain how missing data were addressed | - |
| | | (d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed | - |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|--|---------|
| | | <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy | |
| | | (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses | - |
| Results | | | |
| Participants | 13* | (a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed | 8 |
| | | (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage | 8 |
| | | (c) Consider use of a flow diagram | - |
| Descriptive data | 14* | (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders | 8 |
| | | (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest | 9 |
| | | (c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) | 5 |
| Outcome data | 15* | <i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time | 9-10-11 |
| | | <i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure | - |
| | | <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures | - |
| Main results | 16 | (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included | 10 |
| | | (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized | - |
| | | (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period | - |
| Other analyses | 17 | Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses | - |
| Discussion | | | |
| Key results | 18 | Summarise key results with reference to study objectives | 13 |
| Limitations | 19 | Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias | - |
| Interpretation | 20 | Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence | 16 |
| Generalisability | 21 | Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results | 16 |
| Other information | | | |
| Funding | 22 | Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based | 17 |

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

STROBE 2007 (v4) checklist of items to be included in reports of observational studies in epidemiology*
Checklist for cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies (combined)

| Section/Topic | Item # | Recommendation | Reported on page # |
|---------------------------|--------|--|--------------------|
| Title and abstract | 1 | (a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract | |
| | | (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found | 3 |
| Introduction | | | |
| Background/rationale | 2 | Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported | 3-5 |
| Objectives | 3 | State specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses | 3-5 |
| Methods | | | |
| Study design | 4 | Present key elements of study design early in the paper | 5 |
| Setting | 5 | Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection | 5 |
| Participants | 6 | (a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants | 5 |
| | | (b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case | - |
| Variables | 7 | Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable | |
| Data sources/ measurement | 8* | For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group | 5 |
| Bias | 9 | Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias | - |
| Study size | 10 | Explain how the study size was arrived at | 5 |
| Quantitative variables | 11 | Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why | - |
| Statistical methods | 12 | (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding | - |
| | | (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions | - |
| | | (c) Explain how missing data were addressed | - |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|---|---------|
| | | (d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy | - |
| | | (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses | - |
| Results | | | |
| Participants | 13* | (a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed | 8 |
| | | (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage | 8 |
| | | (c) Consider use of a flow diagram | - |
| Descriptive data | 14* | (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders | 8 |
| | | (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest | 9 |
| | | (c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) | 5 |
| Outcome data | 15* | <i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time | 9-10-11 |
| | | <i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure | - |
| | | <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures | - |
| Main results | 16 | (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included | 10 |
| | | (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized | - |
| | | (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period | - |
| Other analyses | 17 | Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses | - |
| Discussion | | | |
| Key results | 18 | Summarise key results with reference to study objectives | 13 |
| Limitations | 19 | Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias | - |
| Interpretation | 20 | Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence | 16 |
| Generalisability | 21 | Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results | 16 |
| Other information | | | |
| Funding | 22 | Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based | 17 |

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

1
2 **Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE
3 checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at
4 <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

For peer review only