

**RESULTS:** Ninety-nine of 206 children passed the BM challenge; 107 reacted. Of the 107 who reacted at challenge, 58 required some form of treatment, and 24 required epinephrine. Eighty-eight of the 107 children who did not pass the challenge were instructed to consume some amount of BM. At the time of the last follow-up (median = 49 months), 40% had advanced to direct milk, 27% were eating some form of heated milk, and 33% were avoiding all forms of milk. Of those who had failed the challenge but were instructed to ingest some amount of BM, 29% had progressed to direct milk. Passing the BM challenge was associated with greater odds of advancing to less-heated forms of milk (odds ratio: 4.9; 95% confidence interval: 2.5–9.6). Most who had required treatment during the challenge were still practicing strict avoidance at last follow-up. Thirty-five percent of patients experienced milk reactions during the follow-up period; 77% were mild, but 14% were severe, and there were 7.7% who developed eosinophilic esophagitis.

**CONCLUSIONS:** Introduction and advancement of BM in patients with milk allergy is associated with higher odds of advancing their level of milk ingestion but is not without risk. Patients need to be counseled about risk as well as ongoing availability of emergency medications.

**REVIEWER COMMENTS:** Incorporating BM into the diet of patients with milk allergy can be beneficial to allow increased food options. This study demonstrates the importance of performing a BM challenge in patients with milk allergy to determine if BM would be safe to include in the diet. Counseling about the possible risks of BM ingestion is important because reactions to previously tolerated doses and the development of eosinophilic esophagitis are possible.

URL: [www.pediatrics.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2019-2461TT](http://www.pediatrics.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2019-2461TT)

**Paul V. Williams, MD**  
Mount Vernon, Washington

### **AR101 Oral Immunotherapy for Peanut Allergy**

Vickery BP, Vereda A, Casale TB, et al. PALISADE Group of Clinical Investigators. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(21):1991–2001

**PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:** To determine if AR101 is a safe and effective treatment to prevent peanut reactions due to accidental exposure.

**STUDY POPULATION:** Participants (496, 4–17 years old) were randomly assigned 3:1 to receive AR101 (peanut-derived investigational drug) or placebo (oat flour). The majority of the participants had a history of peanut anaphylaxis (72%), asthma (53%), and multiple food allergies (66%). All participants had dose-limiting symptoms at a dose of 100 mg of peanut protein in a double-blind placebo-controlled food challenge at baseline.

**METHODS:** Participants began a 1-day supervised dose escalation phase from 0.5 to 6 mg. The dose was then increased gradually every 2 weeks from 3 to 300 mg. A maintenance dose of 300 mg was continued for 24 weeks.

**RESULTS:** A double-blind placebo-controlled food challenge was done at the end of the trial. Among the participants, 250 of the 372 (67.2%) in the active drug group and 5 of 124 (4%) in the placebo group were able to tolerate a dose of 600 mg or more of peanut protein without dose-limiting symptoms. The key secondary endpoints were tolerating 300 mg (76.6%) or 1000 mg (50.3%) compared with those in the placebo group (8.1% and 2.4%, respectively). Severe reactions occurred in 4.3% of the active drug group and 0.8% of the placebo group. Participants in the active treatment group compared with placebo had a higher incidence of gastrointestinal events (85.8% vs 69.4%), respiratory tract events (81.2% vs 71.8%), skin reactions (66.9% vs 55.6%), and immune system concerns (68.9% vs 8.9%). Overall, 43 (11.6%) in the active treatment group and 3 (2.4%) in the placebo group withdrew because of adverse events. Gastrointestinal symptoms causing study withdrawal occurred in 6.5% of the active treatment group and 1.2% of the placebo group. During the course of the trial, 52 participants (14%) in the active drug group and 8 participants (6.5%) in the placebo group were given epinephrine for grade 1 or 2 reactions; of these, the majority (92.7%) was treated with a single dose of epinephrine.

**CONCLUSIONS:** Overall, 67% of the participants 4 to 17 years old were able to tolerate 600 mg of peanut protein (2 kernels) during the exit food challenge.

**REVIEWER COMMENTS:** These data are important, and AR101 will give health care providers a standardized way forward to treat this potentially life-threatening condition. It is hopeful that the product will be US Food and Drug Administration approved by the time this synopsis is published.

URL: [www.pediatrics.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2019-2461UU](http://www.pediatrics.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2019-2461UU)

**Bradley E. Chipps, MD**  
Sacramento, California

### **Real-World Experience With Peanut Oral Immunotherapy: Lessons Learned From 270 Patients**

Wasserman RL, Hague AR, Pence DM, et al. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. 2019;7(2):418–426.e4

**PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:** This retrospective record review reports observations on the treatment of 270 patients with peanut allergy with peanut oral immunotherapy (POIT).

**STUDY POPULATION:** The study included 270 patients between the ages of 4 and 18 years who received POIT in a single practice between 2009 and 2017. A total of 96.7% of patients had a history of an immunoglobulin E-mediated

reaction, 70.7% had experienced anaphylaxis, 26% had a peanut-specific immunoglobulin E (PSIgE) concentration of >100 kU/mL, and 9.6% had a positive peanut challenge result within 2 years of inception of POIT. No patient was excluded on the basis of severity of previous reaction(s) or PSiGE concentration. Patients with a history of eosinophilic esophagitis or gastroenteritis were excluded.

**METHODS:** The treatment protocol began with 2.5  $\mu$ g of peanut protein. Dose increases were administered under direct observation. Patients reached a target dose of 3000 mg of peanut protein, underwent a 6000-mg challenge, and then began a 2000-mg maintenance dose administered at home 1 to 2 times per day for a minimum of 3 years. The treatment team made dose adjustments and decisions regarding discontinuation of therapy on the basis of collaborative clinical judgment. Patients and caregivers were instructed to report any adverse reactions more significant than transient, self-limited oral pruritis or abdominal discomfort.

**RESULTS:** A total of 214 of 270 patients (79%) completed POIT dose escalation. Age ( $P < .001$ ) and PSiGE ( $P < .001$ ) correlated inversely with completion of dose escalation. For each year increase in patient age after 5, there was a 17% decrease in the odds ratio of reaching the escalation target ( $P < .001$ ). One hundred epinephrine-treated reactions occurred in 63 patients (23%) during escalation. Intermittent asthma and higher PSiGE levels increased the risk of epinephrine-treated reactions ( $P = .035$  and  $.019$ , respectively). Eosinophilic esophagitis-like oral immunotherapy-related syndrome occurred in 37 patients (13.7%). Intermittent asthma and higher PSiGE levels increased the risk of eosinophilic esophagitis-like oral immunotherapy-related syndrome ( $P = .014$  and  $<.001$ , respectively). After 3 years of maintenance treatment, 14 patients were able to achieve sustained peanut unresponsiveness, defined as tolerance of 6000 mg of peanut protein after avoiding peanut for 30 days. The best predictors of sustained unresponsiveness were a pretreatment PSiGE level  $<20$  kU/L and a prechallenge PSiGE level  $<1$  kU/L.

**CONCLUSIONS:** In an allergy office practice, 79% of patients were able to complete a POIT desensitization protocol and maintain a desensitized state with daily peanut dosing.

**REVIEWER COMMENTS:** This study demonstrates that patients can achieve successful peanut desensitization despite a history of previous reaction(s) or markedly elevated PSiGE levels. Epinephrine-treated reactions did occur during POIT, demonstrating that risk of significant allergic reactions was not eliminated. Reduced likelihood of achieving the target dose with increasing age makes early intervention attractive. Additional future studies are necessary to improve risk assessment and

identification of patients likely to achieve sustained unresponsiveness.

URL: [www.pediatrics.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2019-2461W](http://www.pediatrics.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2019-2461W)

Mechelle A. Miller, MD  
Karla L. Davis, MD  
Honolulu, Hawaii

### **Oral Immunotherapy for Peanut Allergy (PACE): A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Efficacy and Safety**

Chu DK, Wood RA, French S, et al. *Lancet*. 2019;393(10187):2222-2232

**PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:** To systematically review the efficacy and safety of peanut oral immunotherapy (OIT) compared with allergen avoidance or placebo OIT for peanut allergy.

**STUDY POPULATION:** The population included individuals with peanut allergy (61% male, 39% female), the majority of whom were children (median age: 8.7 years; interquartile range [IQR]: 5.9-11.2 years) participating in peanut OIT trials in North America, Australia, and Western Europe.

**METHODS:** This systematic review and meta-analysis included a comprehensive search of international health care databases from the United States, Latin America, Europe, and China through December 2018. Authors performed searches for randomized controlled trials comparing peanut OIT to no OIT for the treatment of peanut allergy. The authors screened studies, extracted data, assessed risk of bias, and assessed quality of evidence by the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation approach. The main outcomes included treatment efficacy (ie, proportion of patients passing an oral food challenge), anaphylaxis, allergic or adverse reactions, epinephrine use, and quality of life.

**RESULTS:** Twelve randomized controlled trials were included, with 1041 participants in total undergoing peanut OIT for a median follow-up of 1.0 year (IQR: 0.8-1.4), achieving a median target dose of 2000 mg of peanut protein (IQR: 375-4000). Passing a supervised, in-clinic oral food challenge was more likely in the OIT group. Subjects undergoing peanut OIT had increased anaphylaxis risk (risk ratio: 3.12 [95% confidence interval (CI): 1.76-5.55]), anaphylaxis frequency (incidence rate ratio: 2.72 [95% CI: 1.57-4.72]), and epinephrine use (risk ratio: 2.21 [95% CI: 1.27-3.83]). Peanut OIT increased serious adverse events and nonanaphylactic reactions. These findings were irrespective of OIT protocol, proprietary formulation or not, and phase of OIT (build-up versus maintenance). Quality of life was not different between groups.

## Real-World Experience With Peanut Oral Immunotherapy: Lessons Learned From 270 Patients

Mechelle A. Miller and Karla L. Davis

*Pediatrics* 2019;144;S31

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2019-2461VV

### Updated Information & Services

including high resolution figures, can be found at:  
[http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/144/Supplement\\_1/S31.2](http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/144/Supplement_1/S31.2)

### Permissions & Licensing

Information about reproducing this article in parts (figures, tables) or  
in its entirety can be found online at:  
<http://www.aappublications.org/site/misc/Permissions.xhtml>

### Reprints

Information about ordering reprints can be found online:  
<http://www.aappublications.org/site/misc/reprints.xhtml>

# American Academy of Pediatrics

DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN®



# PEDIATRICS®

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS

## **Real-World Experience With Peanut Oral Immunotherapy: Lessons Learned From 270 Patients**

Mechelle A. Miller and Karla L. Davis

*Pediatrics* 2019;144;S31

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2019-2461VV

The online version of this article, along with updated information and services, is  
located on the World Wide Web at:

[http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/144/Supplement\\_1/S31.2](http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/144/Supplement_1/S31.2)

Pediatrics is the official journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics. A monthly publication, it has been published continuously since 1948. Pediatrics is owned, published, and trademarked by the American Academy of Pediatrics, 345 Park Avenue, Itasca, Illinois, 60143. Copyright © 2019 by the American Academy of Pediatrics. All rights reserved. Print ISSN: 1073-0397.

## American Academy of Pediatrics

DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN®

