

Application of Risk Assessment Methods to Food Allergens

Stephen S. Olin and Julie W. Fitzpatrick International Life Sciences Institute Research Foundation/Risk Science Institute





ILSI RF Project – Risk Assessment for Food Allergen Thresholds

ILSI Europe & TNO Work

ILSI Research Foundation



Risk Assessment for Food Allergen Thresholds

- Question: Can currently available data and risk assessment methods be applied to establishing thresholds for food allergens?
- Approach
 - Steering Committee to define scope and provide direction
 - Working group to gather/analyze data



eddimmoO gnineedC

Robert Buchanan, PhD Wesley Burks, MD René Crevel, PhD Anne Muñoz-Furlong Ian Munro, PhD Craig Llewellyn, PhD Martinus Løvik, MD, PhD

FDA/CFSAN Duke University Unilever, UK FAAN **Cantox, CANADA** Wrigley Co. Norwegian Inst. of Public Health **U. Nebraska**

Steve Taylor, PhD





Route of exposure: ingestion IgE-mediated allergic reactions Focus on elicitation (not sensitization) for modeling doseresponse Develop approach and illustrate with peanut (most data)



Initial Objectives

- Mine the published literature for data to establish dose-response curve
- Characterize population intake distributions of inadvertent allergenic contaminants
- Investigate use of information on allergic response mechanism to estimate theoretical lower limit on minimal eliciting dose (MED)



Mining the Clinical Data

- <u>Goal</u>: To describe the population distribution of MEDs for peanut to determine if a threshold can be established
- Toxicologist's question: What is the shape of the dose-response curve at low doses?
- Risk manager's question: Is there an intake level below which the risk of an allergic response is < [some number]?</p>



Amount of allergen



Mining the Clinical Data

- Most reliable data is from double-blind, placebo-controlled food challenges.
- Published literature is limited in:
 - Number of subjects
 - Individual vs. group data
 - Variable form of dose
 - Response criteria (objective/subjective)
 - Diagnostic vs. challenge studies
 - Other limitations in reporting

🔀 Microsoft Excel - peanutmatrix 📃 🗌 🗵									
📳 Eile Edit View Insert Format Tools Data Window Help 🛛 🗸 🗗 🗙									
Arial $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{B} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{B} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{B} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{E} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U} U$									
1 1 to the two tests in the two tests in the test of test	End Review			_					
$A76 \neq f_{x}$									
A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н		
1									
2									
				Obje	ctive	Obje	ctive		
	Patient			Adjust	ed mg	Respo	nse as		
3 Study/ Reference	Reference	Age	Gender	Prot	tein ²	Repo	orted	Test Material ¹	
				NOAEL	LOAEL	NOAEL	LOAEL		
4				(mg)	(mg)	(mg)	(mg)		
60 Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	7	17y	??	88.93mg	None	355.72mg	None	peanut flour-50%protein	
					N 1	055 70	N 1		
62 Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	8	26y	77	88.93mg	None	355.72mg	None	peanut flour-50%protein	
64 Houribane IACI 1997: 100:596 600	0	249	22	3 03ma	8 93ma	15 72ma	35.72ma	neaput flour, 50%protein	
65		249		0.00mg	0.33119	ro.rzing	55.rzmg	peand: nodi-0070protein	
66 Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	10	20y	??	1.93mg	3.93mg	7.72mg	15.72mg	peanut flour-50%protein	
67				Ŭ		Ŭ		<u>.</u>	
68 Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	11	26y	??	88.93mg	None	355.72mg	None	peanut flour-50%protein	
69									
73									
74									
75	1								
77	-								
78									
79								•	
H + H Peanut - Individual / Peanut - Group / Foot Not	es & Column Descri	otors /		ŀ					
Ready								NUM	
📙 Start 🧔 🔯 🕼 Microsoft Excel - pea < 11:39 AM									

M	Microsoft Excel - peanutmatrix								
😰 File Edit View Insert Format Tools Data Window Help 🛛 🗸 🗗 🗙									
Aria	Arial ▼ 10 ▼ B Z U ≡ ≡ ≡ ፼ \$ % , 18,29 ∉ ∉ □ • Ø • A • _								
-	ta ta 🖓 📭 🌾 🖓 🕅 🖓 🖓 Weely with Changes	Fod Review		-					
	A	В	J	ĸ	L	М	N	0	
1					Su	Imma	ry of Ρι	ublishe	эd
2					· ·				— I
3	Study/ Reference	Patient Reference	Objective Signs or Symptoms for	Severity of Symptoms*	Subje Adjust Prot	ective ed mg :ein ²	Subje Respoi Repo	ctive nse as orted	Sij
4			MED (LOAEL)	- Juiptonio	NOAEL (mg)	LOAEL (mg)	NOAEL (mg)	LOAEL (mg)	f
60	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	7	none	NR			155.72mg	355.72m	зOА
61 62 63	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	8	none	NR			155.72mg	355.72m(g OA
64 65	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	9	vomiting, wheezing, urticaria,lip swelling	moderate			0.08mg	0.18mg	OA
66	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	10	lip swelling, OAS	moderate			0.08mg	0.18mg	OA
67 68 69 73	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	11	none	NR			355.72mg	None	NR
74 75									
76 77									
78									
79									
JI¶ ◀ Read	Fighter Straight - Individual / Peanut - Group / Foot Note 	es & Column Descrip	otors /				NI	LIM	
and the state of t	* Start @ O @ Microsoft Excel - pea Image: Construction of the second s								

M	🛛 Microsoft Excel - peanutmatrix								
📳 File Edit View Insert Format Iools Data Window Help 🛛 🗸 🗗 🗙									
D	🗋 🚔 🔚 🚔 🖓 🖤 🐰 🖻 🛍 • 🚿 να - 🍓 Σ - 👌 ដ 🛍 🦓 115% - 😨 -								
Aria									
<u> </u>		B	P	0	P	6	T 🔺		
<u> </u>	0	U		<u> </u>					
	d Data from Peanut Alleray Challenge Studies								
1				ounac,	anorgy on a	lienge eu	20100		
2									
		Dationt	Subjective	Coupriture			Deliver		
3	Study/ Reference	Patient	Signs or Symptoms	Sevenity ul					
		Kererence	for MED (LOAEL)	Symptoms	Motrix		Dissela		
4					IMIALITA		Гіасерс		
60	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	7	OAS	Mild	Rice pudding	DBPCFC	Rice pudding		
61									
62	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	8	OAS	Mild	Rice pudding	DBPCFC	Rice pudding		
63	Haumitaana 14 01 1007: 100-508-600		0.40	NACLEI	Die e usualationer		Die e veusleling		
65	Hounnane JACI 1997, 100.596-600	8	UAS	Milu	Rice pudding	DBPCFC	Rice pudding		
66	Houribane JACI 1997: 100:596-600	10	OAS	Mild	Rice nudding	DBPCEC	Rice pudding		
67					i dee paaanig		r dee paaanig		
68	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	11	NR	NR	Rice pudding	DBPCFC	Rice pudding		
69									
73									
74									
75									
70	<u> </u>								
78									
79									
14 4	▶ ▶ \Peanut - Individual / Peanut - Group / Foot Note	s & Column Descrip	otors /	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u> </u>		
Read	У					1	MUL MUL		
樻 St	art 🥃 💽 🚱 🔣 🔣 Microsoft Excel - pea	Microsoft Power	Point - [< 11:43 AM		

M	🔀 Microsoft Excel - peanutmatrix								
📳 Eile Edit View Insert Format Tools Data Window Help									
D									
Aria									
- 1 %		Fod Deview		•					
			•						
		B		V	W	X			
	<u>_</u>			v	**				
1									
2									
<u> </u>									
			bd						
3	Study/ Reference	Patient			Type of Study	Population Studied			
<u> </u>		Reference	Dose Time		, type of etady	r opulation otdaled			
			Interval	Dose Escalation Sequence					
60	Houribane JACI 1997: 100:596-600	7	10-15min	0 01 0 02 0 05 0 1 0 25 0 5	Threshold	Peanut allergy			
61		•		1 2 5 10 20 50mg		r canac anorgy			
62	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	8	10-15min	0.01.0.02.0.05.0.1.0.25.0.5.	Threshold	Peanut allergy			
63				1,2,5,10,20,50mg		3,			
64	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	9	10-15min	0.01,0.02,0.05,0.1,0.25,0.5,	Threshold	Peanut allergy			
65				1,2,5,10,20,50mg					
66	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	10	10-15min	0.01,0.02,0.05,0.1,0.25,0.5,	Threshold	Peanut allergy			
67				1,2,5,10,20,50mg					
68	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	11	10-15min	0.01,0.02,0.05,0.1,0.25,0.5,	Threshold	Peanut allergy			
69				1,2,5,10,20,50mg					
73				1,2,5,10,20,50mg					
74									
75		1							
70		.							
70									
79									
10	► N Peanut - Individual / Peanut - Group / Foot Not	es & Column Descrij	l otors /						
Read	ly					NUM			
🦺 St	Start 🤪 🔯 🕼 Microsoft Excel - pea 🖸 Microsoft PowerPoint - [

M	🔀 Microsoft Excel - peanutmatrix 💦 📃 🗵 🗡								
8	🔊 File Edit View Insert Format Tools Data Window Help 🛛 🗸 🗗 🗙								
D									
Aria									
1 25-									
		E <u>n</u> a Review	•						
		B	Y	7					
	0	0		L 2					
1									
2									
				Treatment Given					
3	Study/ Reference	Patient	Other Allergies	Following Adverse	Potential Confounding Factors				
		Reference	_	Reaction					
4									
60	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	7	??	None	??				
61									
62	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	8	??	None	??				
63									
64	Hourihane JACI 1997; 100:596-600	У	??	None	??				
60	Houribana, IACI 1007; 100;506,600	10	22	Nopo	22				
67	Hourinane SACI 1997, 100.090-000	10	i i	NUTE					
68	Hourihane JACI 1997: 100:596-600	11	??	None	??				
69									
73									
74									
75									
76									
77									
78									
13	▶ ▶ ▶ \ Peanut - Individual / Peanut - Group / Foot Note	s & Column Descrip	 otors /						
Read	у				NUM				
樻 St	Start 🤪 🔞 🕼 Microsoft Excel - pea 🖪 Microsoft PowerPoint - [🔍 🔍 11:45 AM								

Dealing with allergens in food; a risk analysis based approach

Dr. Geert F. Houben, TNO Quality of Life On behalf of the Expert Group on Determination of Eliciting Dose, ILSI Europe Food Allergy Task Force

TNO | Knowledge for business



ILSI



Expert Group on Determination of Eliciting Dose, Food Allergy Task Force, ILSI Europe: Dr. David Briggs, Unilever, UK Dr. René Crevel, Unilever, UK Dr. Lutz Edler, German Cancer Research Centre, FRG Dr. Thomas Hatzold, Kraft Foods, FRG Dr. Claudia Hischenhuber, Nestlé, CH Dr. Geert F. Houben, TNO Quality of Life, NL Dr. Jonathan Hourihane, University College Cork, IR Dr. André Knulst, University Medical Centre Utrecht, NL Ms. Fiona Samuels, ILSI Europe, B Dr. Josef Schlatter, Swiss Federal Office of Public Health, CH

Case study

Contamination of chocolate spread with hazelnut proteins

Survey *

- presence of hazelnut protein in chocolate spreads
- according to formulation description & labeling: not expected to contain hazelnut or hazelnut proteins
- Hazelnut protein concentrations: Brand 1: 0.752 +/- 0.059 mg/g Brand 2: 0.115 +/- 0.015 mg/g Brand 3: 0.011 +/- 0.002 mg/g
- Do these contamination levels pose a relevant risk for consumers?

* Koppelman SJ et. al., Journal of Immunological Methods 1999; 229: 107-120



Risk assessment

Concentration	Consumption *	Intake	Threshold	Risk?
mean brand 1 (0.75 mg/g)	mean (19 g)	14 mg	<1 mg	yes
mean brand 2 (0.12 mg/g)		2.2 mg		yes
mean brand 3 (0.01 mg/g)		0.2 mg		not known
worst-case brand 3 (0.02 mg/g)	maximum (60 g)	1.0 mg		yes

* Dutch 3rd national food consumption survey (Hulshof KFAM et al., Eur J Clin Nutr 2003; 57: 128-137) ** Wensing M et al., Clin Exp Allergy 2002; 32(12): 1757-1762

Probabilistic modeling; the idea



Risk assessment methodology developed by TNO - probabilistic assessment chocolate spread case -

- Results for the 3 concentration figures together:
 - highest mean risk:
 - P95 risk:

- < 0.05 % (< 500 x 10⁻⁶)
- < 0.082 % (breakfast) (< 820 x 10⁻⁶)
- < 0.049 % (lunch) (< 500 x 10⁻⁶)
- Results for concentration figure of brand 3:
 - highest mean risk :
 - P95 risk:

- < 0.004 % (< 40 x 10⁻⁶)
 - < 0.02 % (breakfast) (< 200 x 10⁻⁶)
 - < 0.005 % (lunch) (< 50 x 10⁻⁶)

- Each figure based on
 - worst case model
 - total food allergy prevalence
 - all reaction types

Spanjersberg et al, in press, Fd Chem Toxicol







 Seek partners & funding for two ILSI Research Foundation projects:
Risk Assessment for Food Allergen Thresholds
Global Threshold Project
Fundamental biology of thresholds (doseresponse relationships at low doses) for

response relationships at low doses) for chemicals, microbial pathogens, allergens, and nutrients



Thank you!

Steve and Julie

ILSI Research Foundation