

REVIEW ARTICLE

Allergen immunotherapy for insect venom allergy: a systematic review and meta-analysis

S. Dhami¹, H. Zaman², E.-M. Varga³, G. J. Sturm^{4,5}, A. Muraro⁶, C. A. Akdis^{7,8}, D. Antolín-Amérigo⁹, M. B. Bilò¹⁰, D. Bokanovic⁴, M. A. Calderon¹¹, E. Cichocka-Jarosz¹², J. N. G. Oude Elberink^{13,14}, R. Gawlik¹⁵, T. Jakob¹⁶, M. Kosnik¹⁷, J. Lange¹⁸, E. Mingomataj^{19,20}, D. I. Mitsias²¹, H. Mosbech²², M. Ollert²³, O. Pfaar^{24,25,26}, C. Pitsios²⁷, V. Pravettoni²⁸, G. Roberts^{29,30,31}, F. Ruëff³², B. A. Sin³³, M. Asaria³⁴, G. Netuveli³⁵ & A. Sheikh³⁶

¹Evidence-Based Health Care Ltd, Edinburgh, UK; ²School of Pharmacy, University of Bradford, Bradford, UK; ³Department of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine, Respiratory and Allergic Disease Division, Medical University of Graz, Graz; ⁴Department of Dermatology and Venerology, Medical University of Graz, Graz; ⁵Outpatient Allergy Clinic Reumannplatz, Vienna, Austria; ⁶Department of Women and Child Health, Food Allergy Referral Centre Veneto Region, Padua General University Hospital, Padua, Italy; ⁷Swiss Institute of Allergy and Asthma Research (SIAF), Switzerland Servicio de Enfermedades del Sistema Inmune-Alergia, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland; ⁸Departamento de Medicina y Especialidades Médicas, Hospital Universitario Príncipe de Asturias; ⁹Universidad de Alcalá, Madrid, Spain; ¹⁰Allergy Unit, Department of Internal Medicine, University Hospital of Ancona, Ancona, Italy; ¹¹Section of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, Imperial College London, National Heart and Lung Institute, Royal Brompton Hospital, London, UK; ¹²Department of Pediatrics, Jagiellonian University Medical College, Krakow, Poland; ¹³Department of Allergology and Internal Medicine, University of Groningen, University Medical Hospital Groningen; ¹⁴Groningen Research Center for Asthma and COPD (GRIAC), Groningen, The Netherlands; ¹⁵Department of Internal Medicine, Allergy and Clinical Immunology, Medical University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland; ¹⁶Department of Dermatology and Allergology, University Medical Center Gießen and Marburg (UKGM), Justus Liebig University Gießen, Gießen, Germany; ¹⁷Medical Faculty Ljubljana, University Clinic of Respiratory and Allergic Diseases Golnik, Golnik, Slovenia; ¹⁸Department of Pediatric Pneumonology and Allergy, Medical University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland; ¹⁹Department of Allergology and Clinical Immunology, Mother Theresa School of Medicine; ²⁰Department of Paraclinical Disciplines, Faculty of Technical Medical Sciences, Medicine University of Tirana, Tirana, Albania; ²¹Department of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, 2nd Pediatric Clinic, University of Athens, Athens, Greece; ²²Allergy Clinic, Copenhagen University Hospital Gentofte, Gentofte, Denmark; ²³Department of Infection and Immunity, Luxembourg Institute of Health (LIH), Strassen, Luxembourg; ²⁴Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Universitätsmedizin Mannheim, Mannheim; ²⁵Medical Faculty Mannheim, Heidelberg University, Heidelberg; ²⁶Center for Rhinology Allergology, Wiesbaden, Germany; ²⁷Medical School, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus; ²⁸UOC Clinical Allergy and Immunology, IRCCS Foundation Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy; ²⁹The David Hide Asthma and Allergy Research Centre, St Mary's Hospital, Newport Isle of Wight; ³⁰NIHR Respiratory Biomedical Research Unit, University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust; ³¹Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK; ³²Klinik und Poliklinik für Dermatologie und Allergologie, Klinikum der Universität München, Munich, Germany; ³³Department of Pulmonary Diseases, Division of Immunology and Allergy, Faculty of Medicine, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey; ³⁴Research Fellow Centre for Health Economics, University of York, UK; ³⁵Institute for Health and Human Development, University of East London, London; ³⁶Allergy and Respiratory Research Group, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

To cite this article: Dhami S, Zaman H, Varga E-M, Sturm GJ, Muraro A, Akdis CA, Antolín-Amérigo D, Bilò MB, Bokanovic D, Calderon MA, Cichocka-Jarosz E, Oude Elberink JNG, Gawlik R, Jakob T, Kosnik M, Lange J, Mingomataj E, Mitsias DI, Mosbech H, Ollert M, Pfaar O, Pitsios C, Pravettoni V, Roberts G, Ruëff F, Sin BA, Netuveli G, Sheikh A. Allergen immunotherapy for insect venom allergy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Allergy* 2017; **72**: 342–365.

Keywords

Allergy; anaphylaxis; hymenoptera venom allergy; insect venom allergy; systemic sting reaction.

Correspondence

Dr. Sangeeta Dhami, Evidence-Based Health Care Ltd, Edinburgh, UK.
E-mail: sangeetadhami@hotmail.com

Accepted for publication 31 October 2016

DOI:10.1111/all.13077

Edited by: Thomas Bieber

Abstract

Background: The European Academy of Allergy and Clinical Immunology (EAACI) is in the process of developing the EAACI Guidelines on Allergen Immunotherapy (AIT) for the management of insect venom allergy. To inform this process, we sought to assess the effectiveness, cost-effectiveness and safety of AIT in the management of insect venom allergy.

Methods: We undertook a systematic review, which involved searching 15 international biomedical databases for published and unpublished evidence. Studies were independently screened and critically appraised using established instruments. Data were descriptively summarized and, where possible, meta-analysed.

Results: Our searches identified a total of 16 950 potentially eligible studies; of which, 17 satisfied our inclusion criteria. The available evidence was limited both in volume and in quality, but suggested that venom immunotherapy (VIT) could substantially reduce the risk of subsequent severe systemic sting reactions ($OR = 0.08$,

[The copyright line for this article was changed on November 22, 2017 after original online publication]

95% CI 0.03–0.26); meta-analysis showed that it also improved disease-specific quality of life (risk difference = 1.41, 95% CI 1.04–1.79). Adverse effects were experienced in both the build-up and maintenance phases, but most were mild with no fatalities being reported. The very limited evidence found on modelling cost-effectiveness suggested that VIT was likely to be cost-effective in those at high risk of repeated systemic sting reactions and/or impaired quality of life.

Conclusions: The limited available evidence suggested that VIT is effective in reducing severe subsequent systemic sting reactions and in improving disease-specific quality of life. VIT proved to be safe and no fatalities were recorded in the studies included in this review. The cost-effectiveness of VIT needs to be established.

Hymenoptera venom allergy is a potentially life-threatening allergic reaction following a bee, wasp (i.e. paper wasp, yellow jacket or hornet) or ant (i.e. fire ants) sting. The risk of anaphylaxis to hymenoptera stings is greater in adults compared to children due to increased sting exposure, comorbidities and concomitant medication use. Systemic reactions have been reported in up to 3% of adults, but in less than 1% of children (1, 2).

Symptoms range from large local reactions at the sting site to mild, moderate and severe systemic reactions. Mild systemic reactions usually manifest as generalized skin symptoms including flush, urticaria and angioedema. Typically, dizziness, dyspnoea and nausea are examples of moderate reactions, while shock and loss of consciousness, or even cardiac or respiratory arrest, all define a severe sting reaction. Seemingly mild reactions can progress into more severe reactions with little warning. The fear of future severe systemic reactions usually greatly impairs quality of life. Around a quarter of fatalities from anaphylaxis are caused by venom allergy (3–5).

Patients are advised to carry an emergency kit comprising adrenaline (epinephrine), H₁-antihistamines and corticosteroids depending on the severity of their previous sting reaction(s) (6). The only treatment that can potentially prevent further systemic sting reactions is venom immunotherapy (VIT). This may result in long-term clinical benefits and improved quality of life (7, 8). However, despite these possible advantages, VIT is still not commonly used by physicians across all European countries (9). This is likely to reflect uncertainty about the clinical benefits and risks associated with the use of VIT, uncertainties about the ethics of mounting further formal experimental studies when VIT is established practice in some countries, as well as the practical and economic implications associated with this treatment.

The European Academy of Allergy and Clinical Immunology (EAACI) is in the process of developing guidelines for AIT. This systematic review is one of five interlinked

evidence syntheses that were undertaken in order to provide a state-of-the-art synopsis of the current evidence base in relation to evaluating AIT for the treatment of insect venom allergy, allergic rhinoconjunctivitis, food allergy, allergic asthma and allergy prevention (10–14). These reviews will be used to contribute to and inform the formulation of key clinical recommendations for subsequent clinical practice guidelines.

Aims

We assessed the effectiveness, safety and cost-effectiveness of VIT for the treatment of insect venom allergy.

Methods

The detailed methods for this review have already been described in our published protocol (10). Here, we provide a more succinct account of the methods employed.

Search strategy

A highly sensitive search strategy was developed, and validated study design filters were applied to retrieve all articles pertaining to the use of VIT for insect venom allergy from electronic bibliographic databases (Appendix S1). We conceptualized the searches to incorporate the four elements below as shown in Fig. 1.

To retrieve systematic reviews, we used the systematic review filter developed at McMaster University Health Information Research Unit (HIRU) (http://hiru.mcmaster.ca/hiru/HIRU_Hedges_MEDLINE_Strategies.aspx#Reviews). To retrieve randomized controlled trials (RCTs), we applied the Cochrane highly sensitive search strategy for identifying RCTs in MEDLINE (15). To retrieve nonrandomized studies, that is

Abbreviations

AAI, Adrenaline auto-injector; AIT, allergen immunotherapy; CBA, controlled before-and-after studies; CCT, controlled clinical trial; CI, confidence interval; EAACI, European Academy of Allergy and Clinical Immunology; EPOC, Effective Practice and Organisation of Care; ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; ITS, interrupted time series; NCCT, nonrandomized controlled clinical trial; NHS, National Health Service; NICE, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; OR, odds ratio; PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; PROSPERO, International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews; QALY, quality-adjusted life year; RCT, randomized controlled trials; RR, risk ratio; VIT, venom immunotherapy; WAO, World Allergy Organization; WBE, whole-body extract immunotherapy.




Figure 1 Conceptualization of systematic review of allergen immunotherapy for insect venom allergy (10).

controlled clinical trials (CCT), controlled before-and-after (CBA) and interrupted time-series (ITS) studies, we used the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care (EPOC) filter version 2.4, available on request from the EPOC Group (16, 17). To retrieve case series, we used the filter developed by librarians at Clinical Evidence: <http://clincalevidence.bmj.com/x/set/static/ebm/learn/665076.html>.

We searched the following databases: Cochrane Library including Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR), Database of Reviews of Effectiveness (DARE), CENTRAL (Trials), Methods Studies, Health Technology Assessments (HTA), Economic Evaluations Database (EED), MEDLINE (OVID), Embase (OVID), CINAHL (Ebsco-host), ISI Web of Science (Thomson Web of Knowledge), TRIP Database (www.tripdatabase.com), Clinicaltrials.gov (NIH web), Clinicaltrialsregister.eu, Current controlled trials (www.controlled-trials.com) and the Australian and New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (<http://www.anzctr.org.au>).

The search strategy was developed on OVID MEDLINE and then adapted for the other databases (see Supporting information). In all cases, the databases were searched from inception to 31 October 2015. Additional references were included through searching the references cited by the identified studies, and unpublished work and research in progress was identified through discussion with experts in the field (see Supporting information). We invited a panel of interdisciplinary external experts in the field from different regions to add to the list of included studies by identifying additional published and unpublished papers they are aware of and research in progress (Appendix S2). There were no language restrictions employed; where possible, all relevant literature was translated into English.

Inclusion criteria

Patient characteristics

We were interested in identifying studies conducted on patients of any age with a physician-confirmed diagnosis of systemic sting reaction to a venom sting from bees, wasps (i.e. *paper wasp*, *yellow jacket* or *hornet*) or fire ants.

Interventions of interest

We considered VIT using different products (purified and nonpurified, aqueous or depot IT) and different treatment protocols (conventional, cluster, rush and ultra-rush) (18) administered through the subcutaneous (SCIT) or sublingual (SLIT) routes.

Comparators

We were interested in studies comparing VIT with placebo or no treatment (i.e. the natural course of the disease).

Study designs

Systematic reviews of RCTs and CCTs were used to investigate effectiveness; health economic analyses were used to assess cost-effectiveness; and systematic reviews, RCTs and case series, with a minimum of 300 patients, were used to assess safety. We appraised the evidence by looking at higher levels of evidence such as systematic reviews and/or meta-analyses of RCTs, together with individual RCTs. However, as we were expecting to find only a limited number of RCTs, we also searched for and included quasi-RCTs (i.e. nonrandomized controlled clinical trials (CCTs), controlled before-and-after (CBA) studies and interrupted time-series (ITS) analyses). Given the high inherent risk of bias in making inferences from quasi-RCTs, our main conclusions in relation to effectiveness have been based on the findings of systematic reviews and RCTs; findings from the quasi-RCTs have only been used to guide suggestions on which areas need to be prioritized in future research (19).

Our exclusion criteria were as follows: narrative reviews, discussion papers, nonresearch letters and editorials, animal studies, before-after studies, qualitative studies and case series (involving less than 300 patients).

Outcomes

Primary.

- Our primary outcome measure of interest was short- and long-term efficacy assessed by tolerated sting challenge or

field sting; long-term was defined as sustained clinical efficacy after discontinuation of VIT.

Secondary. Our secondary outcome measures of interest were as follows:

- Assessment of disease-specific quality of life
- Safety as assessed by local and systemic reactions in accordance with the World Allergy Organization's (WAO) grading system of side-effects (20, 21)
- Health economic analysis from the perspective of the health system/payer.

Study selection

All references were uploaded into the systematic review software DistillerSR and de-duplication was undertaken. Study titles were independently checked by two reviewers (SD and HZ) according to the above selection criteria and categorized as included, not included or unsure. For those papers in the unsure category, we retrieved the abstract and re-categorized studies as above. Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion and, when necessary, a third reviewer arbitrated (AS). Full-text copies of all potentially relevant studies were obtained and their eligibility for inclusion independently assessed. Studies that did not fulfil all of the inclusion criteria were excluded.

Quality assessment strategy

Quality assessments were independently carried out on each study by two reviewers (SD and HZ) using the relevant version of the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) quality assessment tool for systematic reviews and health economic evaluations (22). We assessed the risk of bias of experimental studies using the criteria suggested by the Cochrane EPOC Group (23). RCTs, CCTs and CBAs were assessed for generation of allocation sequence, concealment of allocation, baseline outcome measurements, baseline characteristics, incomplete outcome data, blinding of outcome assessor, protection against contamination, selective outcome reporting and other risks of bias using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool (24). For ITS designs, we planned to assess the independence of the intervention from secular trends, the prespecified shape of the intervention and whether the intervention may have had an impact on data collection. These methodological assessments drew on the principles incorporated into the Cochrane EPOC guidelines for assessing intervention studies (25). We used the quality assessment form produced by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) to critically appraise case series (26). Any discrepancies were resolved by discussion or, if agreement could not be reached, by arbitration by the third reviewer (AS).

Analysis, data synthesis and reporting

Data were independently extracted onto a customized data extraction sheet in DistillerSR by two reviewers (SD or AK

and HZ), and any discrepancies were resolved. To minimize the risk of bias, reviewers were not involved in the quality appraisal of their own studies.

A descriptive summary with data tables was produced to summarize the literature. A narrative synthesis of the data was undertaken. Where possible, and appropriate, meta-analysis was undertaken using random-effects modelling using Stata (version 14) (15).

Sensitivity and subgroup analyses and assessment for publication bias

We planned to undertake sensitivity analyses by comparing the summary estimates obtained by excluding studies judged to be at high risk of bias, but were unable to do this because of insufficient data.

We planned to perform the following subgroup analyses, but were unable to undertake any of these due to insufficient data:

- Children (5–11 years) vs adolescents (12–17 years) vs adults (≥ 18 years)
- Conventional vs cluster vs rush vs ultra-rush protocols in SCIT
- Conventional in SLIT vs SCIT
- Three vs five years of treatment
- Different allergen doses (50 µg vs 100 µg vs 200 µg of maintenance VIT)
- Bee vs wasp vs fire ant venom
- Patients with and without co-existent mast cell disorders (27).

We were unable to assess publication bias through the creation of funnel plots due to the small number of studies, but were able to use Begg's rank correlation test (28).

Registration and reporting

This review has been registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO): <http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/>. The registration number is CRD42016035374. The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist was used to guide the reporting of the systematic review: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/> (Appendix S3; see Supporting information).

Results

Overview of results

Our searches identified a total of 16 950 potentially eligible studies; of which, 17 satisfied our eligibility criteria and were therefore included in this review (see Fig. 2). The key characteristics and main findings of all included studies are detailed in Table 1 and the quality assessment of these studies is summarized in Tables 2–4. The main findings are discussed in more detail below.

Of the 17 included articles, five were systematic reviews (29–33); two of these systematic reviews undertook meta-analyses




Figure 2 PRISMA diagram: allergen immunotherapy for insect venom allergy.

(29, 33). The remaining 12 studies comprised five RCTs (34–38), three CBAs (39–41) and four case series (42–45).

Four of the systematic reviews looked at the effectiveness of VIT (29–31, 33), two at safety (29, 32) one at cost-effectiveness (31) and one at disease specific quality of life (29). Two of the RCTs looked at both effectiveness and disease-specific quality of life-related issues in adults (35, 36). Two RCTs looked at the effectiveness of VIT in children (37, 38); and a further RCT studied both children and adults (33). One CBA solely focused on the safety of rush VIT protocol in adults (40), a second CBA looked at the long-term follow-up of children following VIT (39), and the third looked at the effect of VIT on anaphylactic sting reactions (41). Finally, four case series studies investigated safety considerations (42–45). All of the primary studies included in this review investigated SCIT.

Effectiveness of VIT as judged by the risk of systemic sting reactions

Twelve studies looked at the effectiveness of VIT. Four of these were systematic reviews, all of which were assessed to

be of high quality (29–31, 33). The remaining studies were RCTs ($n = 5$) (34–38) and CBAs ($n = 3$) (39–41).

Systematic reviews

Boyle et al.'s (29) systematic review included six RCTs and one quasi-RCT. Three of the RCTs studied in this review also satisfied our eligibility criteria and these are therefore considered in detail below (34, 37, 38). The others were excluded because they did not meet our inclusion criteria. These included Brown et al. (46), which looked at the jack jumper ant, which was not an insect of interest in the protocol; Oude Elberink et al. (47), which focussed on the burden of treatment of carriage of an adrenaline (epinephrine) auto-injector compared to VIT, which was not an outcome of interest; and Golden et al. (48) and Severino et al. (49), which both included patients who had experienced large local reactions rather than a systemic reaction to an insect sting.

The primary outcome of interest in Boyle et al. (29) was systemic reaction rates to a 'field' or a challenge sting in patients during the follow-up period of VIT treatment. The review concluded that VIT was effective in preventing

Table 1 Characteristics of included studies

Author/year/article title/country	Study design	Participants with physician-confirmed diagnosis of systemic sting reaction to a venom sting from	Number of studies (N)/subjects included/nage	Outcome of interest	Comparators (intervention/controls/route of administration)	VIT using different products	Quality	Main outcome	Comment
Boyle et al. (2012) Venom immunotherapy for preventing allergic reactions to insect stings: a Cochrane systematic review Worldwide	SR of RCTs and quasi-RCTs	All ages eligible N = 7 n = 392	Physician-confirmed diagnosis of systemic reaction to bees, wasps or fire ants	Primary: systemic reaction to a 'field' insect sting or a sting challenge during treatment. Fatal SR due to a field or challenge insect sting over the same period. Secondary: large local reactions to a field sting or sting challenge during treatment or during the 10 years following treatment.	Standardized venom extract vs placebo, no treatment or back-up treatment	SLIT 1 trial SCIT 6 trials	High	Six RCTs and one quasi-RCT included ant, bee and wasp immunotherapy in children and adults with previous systemic or large local reactions to a sting, using sublingual (one trial) or subcutaneous (six trials) VIT	Undertook additional analysis of 11 observational studies to estimate risk of adverse events
Dhami et al. (2013) Management of anaphylaxis: a systematic review Worldwide	SR RCTs, quasi-RCTs, CBAs, ITS and case series	N = 55; but only 16 relevant to VIT	Patients with an anaphylaxis reaction to venom	Long-term management of venom anaphylaxis by use of VIT	VIT vs no-VIT	SCIT	High	Between 1978 and 1985, of 1033 children, 356 received VIT. 1987–2000 postal and telephone surveys were used to assess the long-term outcome. 512 (50%) patients replied. VIT results in significantly lower sting reactions compared to no VIT P = 0.007. This prolonged benefit was seen in children aged 10 to 20 years after Rx is greater than that seen in adults	
Golden et al. (2004) Outcomes of allergy to insect stings in children, with and without venom immunotherapy. USA	CBA	n = 1033	Allergy to bees or paper wasps	Outcome of allergic reactions to stings 10 to 20 years after VIT or no-VIT in children	VIT vs no-VIT	SCIT	Low	Tolerance to a challenge sting of the insect. They were most sensitive to if they tolerated a venom dose greater than that found in a sting	

Table 1 (continued)

Author/year/article title/country	Study design	Participants with physician-confirmed diagnosis of systemic sting reaction to a venom sting from	Outcome of interest	Comparators (intervention/controls/route of administration	VIT using different products	Quality	Main outcome	Comment
Hunt et al. (1978) A controlled trial of immunotherapy in insect hypersensitivity. USA	RCT Single blind	n = 59 Age = 15–59 years	Physician-confirmed diagnosis of systemic sting reaction to a venom sting from honeybee or yellow jacket. Patients with a history of a generalized allergic reaction to a sting were included; some had a previous anaphylactic reaction to a sting.	Standardized venom extract vs placebo or whole-body extract. Three matched groups were given placebo, whole-body extract or venom immunotherapy.	SCIT; semi-rush protocol	Low	Venom group after receiving a dose of 100 mcg were sting-challenged. 18 stung, one had mild urticaria. One patient was not challenged as failed to tolerate treatment	Of 59 patients, 58 successfully achieved desensitization with venom immunotherapy. Advocate use of venom immunotherapy over whole-body extract for the prevention of life-threatening reactions to insect stings.
Park et al. (2015) Risk associated with bee venom therapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Worldwide	SR	N = 145 20 RCTs, 79 audits and cohort studies, 33 single case studies, 13 case series	Any user of bee venom therapy	Frequency and type of adverse event to bee venom therapy	Safety considerations, all study types included	Low	Bee venom acupuncture, bee sting acupuncture, conventional VIT, cluster VIT, rush VIT, ultra-rush VIT, SIT, rush-specific immunotherapy.	Most of the studies in this SR do not meet our inclusion criteria and did not look at VIT. Two RCTs included which look at the incidence of adverse events in VIT. Oude Elberink et al. (2006); no systemic AEs are reported. 63 case series/cohort studies looked at VIT and showed prevalence of AEs ranged from 0.0% to 90.63%. In the 46 VIT studies, the median AE was 28.7%, these include SRs (60.37%), LR (35.8%), and LLR (9.99%)

Table 1 (continued)

Author/year/article title/country	Study design	Number of studies (N/subjects included/n/expt)	Participants with physician-confirmed diagnosis of systemic sting reaction to a venom sting from	Outcome of interest	Comparators (intervention/controls/route of administration)	VIT using different products	Quality	Main outcome	Comment
Pasaoglu et al. (2006) Rush hymenoptera venom immunotherapy is efficacious and safe. Turkey	CBA	n = 18 Age 18–53 seven treated with <i>Vespa</i> venom, seven treated with honeybee venom, four control group	Physician-confirmed diagnosis of a systemic sting reaction to yellow jacket or honeybee	Side-effects of rush VIT Clinical response	VIT vs control group	SCIT; rush	Low	Seven-day rush VIT protocol followed as inpatients; 14 patients received 469 injections in 1 year, 240 for bee venom, 229 for yellow jacket. Four systemic reactions occurred (0.85%) in one patient to bee venom during the build-up phase. Reactions treated with antihistamines, bronchodilators, adrenaline, corticosteroids.	Two patients experienced field stings, while one patient, a bee keeper, experienced multiple stings; no systemic reactions occurred.
Reisman et al. (1985) Stinging insect allergy: natural history and modification with venom immunotherapy. USA	CBA	n = 271 Age = 4–83	Sting anaphylaxis to honeybee, yellow jacket, bald-faced hornet and <i>Polistes</i> venoms	The natural history of sting anaphylaxis and its modification with VIT	VIT or no-VIT or premature discontinuation of VIT	SCIT conventional of rush	Maintenance dose 50 µg Not sure of identity of insects in re-stings as accidental	Rush VIT is safe and effective. 127 patients received VIT for 6 months to 9 years – 39 (31%) honeybee venom, 51 (40%) yellow jacket venom, 26 (22%) honeybee and yellow jacket venoms, seven (5%) multiple vespid venoms, two received multiple vespid and honeybee venoms, one hornet venom and one <i>Polistes</i> venom. Most received 50 µg maintenance dose at 4–6 weeks. 87 re-stings in 48 patients, two SRs.	Maintenance dose 50 µg Not sure of identity of insects in re-stings as accidental

Table 1 (continued)

Author/year/article title/country	Study design	Participants with physician-confirmed diagnosis of systemic sting reaction to a venom sting from	Number of studies (N/subjects included/n/age)	Outcome of interest	Comparators (intervention/ control)/route of administration	VIT using different products	Quality	Main outcome	Comment
Schubert et al. (1983) Epidemiologic study of insect allergy in IL. Effect of accidental stings in allergic children. USA	Comprehensive cohort design includes an RCT	n = 181 Age = 3–16	Non-life-threatening systemic reactions to bees, wasps, yellow jackets, yellow- and white-faced hornets	Blood samples for antibody titres, yearly skin tests and toxicity studies, skin tests, antibody measurements and accidental stings	VIT or no treatment	SCIT	Moderate	Children were randomized to VIT or no-VIT, ratio of 1:1.5. Those who did not want to be randomized chose their own Rx. The results for randomized and nonrandomized are not presented separately.	Children only with non-life-threatening systemic reactions were included. Those with respiratory or cardiovascular symptoms were given VIT.
Valentine et al. (1990) The value of immunotherapy with venom in children with allergy to insect stings. USA	Comprehensive cohort design includes an RCT	n = 242 Children aged 2–16	Physician-confirmed diagnosis of a systemic sting reaction to bees or wasps	Accidental stings during 4 years were evaluated	VIT vs no-VIT	SCIT	Moderate/Low	Randomization ratio of 1.5 to 1. Group 1a no-VIT = 61, 1ba VIT = 45. Nonrandomized: 2a no-VIT = 113, 2b VIT = 23.	Systemic reaction confined to the skin Only 18.6% of children who were not treated went on to have subsequent systemic sting reactions.

Table 1 (continued)

Author/year/article title/country	Study design	Number of studies included(n)/age	Outcome of interest	Comparators (intervention/ control/route of administration)	VIT using different products	Quality	Main outcome	Comment
Watanabe et al. (2010) Specific immunotherapy using Hymenoptera venom: systematic review. Brazil	SR	N = 4, n = 2273 Children and adults	Anaphylaxis to sting reaction plus positive skin test to any hymenoptera insects	Change in clinical reaction following sting or field challenge	Venom immunotherapy vs placebo or no treatment	High	Risk of systemic reactions after specific immunotherapy was evaluated using odds ratios plus their 95 % confidence intervals. It was appropriate to do meta-analysis of two trials in children (OR = 0.29; 95% CI 0.10, 0.87) for systemic reactions after further analysis of accidental stings in VIT-treated children. No indication for VIT in children who have only had a cutaneous reaction following a sting. Conclude that specific VIT should be recommended for children with previous moderate-to-severe reactions and adults with previous systemic reactions.	Lack of allocation concealment and the fact that the trials were not double-blind may have contributed to overestimation of the treatment effect

Table 1 (continued)

Author/year/article title/country	Study design	Number of studies (N) subjects included/n/age	Outcome of interest	Comparators (intervention/ controls/route of administration	VIT using different products	Quality	Main outcome	Comment
Oude Elberink et al. (2002) Venom immunotherapy improves health-related quality of life in patients allergic to yellow jacket venom. The Netherlands	Comprehensive cohort design includes an RCT	n = 74 randomized; N = 74 nonrandomized Age: 18–65	Yellow jacket wasps	Health-related quality of life instrument. Vespid Allergy Quality of life Questionnaire in patients allergic to yellow jacket treated with VIT or adrenaline auto-injector	Comparison of HRQL outcomes measured with a disease-specific quality of life instrument.	Moderate Semi-ush protocol	VQLQ score calculated from mean of 14 items, range of 1, severe impairment of HRQL to 7, no impairment. Mean change in VQLQ score was calculated. Randomized group: pretreatment scores were similar, results from 34 VIT group and 35 adrenaline auto-injector group. Mean VQLQ score improved more in the VIT group, from 3.28 to 4.35 ($P < 0.0001$) compared to the adrenaline auto-injector group – score decreased from 3.34 to 2.9 ($P < 0.003$). Mean change in VIT group is 1.07 (95% CI 0.68 to 1.46); mean change in adrenaline auto-injector group is –0.43 (95% CI –0.71 to –0.16); mean difference between the two groups is 1.51 (95% CI 1.04–1.98).	Half of patients refused randomization and 80% wanted to start VIT. Patients choosing VIT had greater improvement in scores.

Table 1 (continued)

Author/year/article title/country	Study design	Participants with physician-confirmed diagnosis of systemic sting reaction to a venom sting from	Outcome of interest	Comparators (intervention/controls)/route of administration	VIT using different products	Quality	Main outcome	Comment
Oude Elberink et al. (2009) Immunotherapy improves health-related quality of life of adult patients with dermal reactions following yellow jacket stings. the Netherlands	Comprehensive cohort design includes an RCT	Randomized n = 29, VIT = 15, adrenaline auto-injector = 14 Nonrandomized n = 26, VIT = 11, adrenaline auto-injector = 15	Yellow jacket wasps	Health-related quality of life	Comparison of HRQL outcomes measured with a disease-specific quality of life instrument – Vespid Allergy Quality of Life Questionnaire (VQLQ) in patients allergic to yellow jacket venom treated with VIT or with an adrenaline auto-injector in an open-label RCT.	Moderate	HRQL was measured using the Vespid allergy Quality of Life Questionnaire (VQLQ). Anxiety was measured using the Spielberg State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STA).	Systemic reaction confined to the skin. Patients with mastocytosis were excluded.

Table 1 (continued)

Author/year/article title/country	Study design	Participants with physician-confirmed diagnosis of systemic sting reaction to a venom sting from	Outcome of interest	Comparators (intervention/controls)/route of administration	VIT using different products	Quality	Main outcome	Comment
Brehler et al. (2000) Safety of a two-day ultra-rush insect venom immunotherapy protocol in comparison with protocols of longer duration and involving a larger number of injections. Germany	Case series	N = 966 Bee VIT = 122 Wasp VIT = 933 Age = 2 to 84	Bee or wasp allergy	Does shortening the seven- to nine-day rush protocol to 2 days and increasing the initial administered dose increase the incidence and severity of side-effects	Safety SCIT Rush	Low	Cohort 1: n = 317, 20 injections over 7–9 days Cohort 2: n = 335, 72.2% had 10, 11, 12 or 14 injections, mainly 3 to 5 days Cohort 3: n = 403, nine injections over two-day protocol, No statistical difference between the cohorts at the beginning No life-threatening anaphylactic reactions occurred 224 (21.2%) patients had an adverse reaction; 124 (11.8%) generalized skin reactions; 160 (15.2%) systemic reactions; seven (0.7%) had a drop in BP of less than 20%, but did not need epinephrine Overall it demonstrates the safety of a two-day VIT protocol	

Table 1 (continued)

Author/year/article title/country	Study design	Participants with physician-confirmed diagnosis of systemic sting reaction to a venom sting from	Number of studies (N/subjects included/age)	Outcome of interest	Comparators (intervention/ control/route of administration)	VIT using different products	Quality	Main outcome	Comment
Mosbech et al. (2000) Side-effects of insect venom immunotherapy: results from an EAACI multicentre study. Europe	Case series Multicentre	Honeybee, wasp or paper wasp allergy Vespuva venom Honeybee venom 27% mean age: 41 years (range: 5 ± 77 years)	N = 840 457 males and 383 females	Analyse the character and frequency of side-effects and risk-factors of VIT	Safety	SCIT Conventional, rush and cluster protocols. Protocols were not harmonized across centres	417 males and 365 females were treated with one venom extract. Fifty-eight patients had two venom extract treatments concomitantly. A total of 26 801 injections were given, 23 602 to patients receiving treatment with only one extract. A total of 299 systemic side-effects were reported; of these, 280 occurred in patients treated with one venom. 20% of the patients had at least one systemic reaction and 1.2% of infections elicited reactions. The majority of systemic symptoms were mild; one-third required treatment. Oral antihistamine was the drug most frequently used. A drop in BP in nine cases, but only one patient received adrenaline. This patient and one other patient suffered fainting/collapse. The frequency of reactions was higher during the dose-increase phase than during the maintenance phase (mean: 1.9% vs 0.5% of all injections).	When analysed separately, female sex, rapid dose-increase regimens and treatment with bee venom extract seemed to increase the risk of side-effects. Patients with pre-existing allergic rhinitis more often had side-effects (29% vs 19%, $P < 0.05$). The following factors did not influence the risk of systemic side-effects in either separate analyses or logistic regression: age, pre-existing asthma or urticaria, severity of original insect sting symptoms, time interval between sting and symptoms, the number of systemic sting reactions, progression in sting reactions, type of extract (with or without aluminium hydroxide) and the number of venom extracts used for treatment (one or two).	

Table 1 (continued)

Author/year/article title/country	Study design	Number of studies included(n)/size	Outcome of interest	Comparators/intervention/control/route of administration	VIT using different products	Quality	Main outcome	Comment
Rüeff et al. (2010) Predictors of side-effects during the build-up phase of venom immunotherapy for hymenoptera venom allergy: The importance of baseline serum typhase. Europe	Case series	N = 680	Honeybee or vespid allergy	Emergency intervention during the build-up phase of VIT	Conventional, rush and ultra-rush	Low	27.5% had a Grade III or IV index field sting. 24.9% had prophylactic antiallergy Rx before VIT. Conventional 10.3%; rush 55%; ultra-rush 34.7%.	Patients undergoing VIT to bee venom need closer observation
Stoevesandt et al. (2014) Risk stratification of systemic allergic reactions during hymenoptera venom immunotherapy build-up phase. Germany	Case series	n = 818 Age 7–84 Honeybee = 160 (19.6%) Vespa = 658 (80.4%)	Physician-confirmed diagnosis of a systemic sting reaction to honeybees or wasps	Systematically evaluate the time course and clinical symptoms of VIT-related systemic reaction	Safety Rush	Low	In patient rush protocol, 220 (22.5%) five-day protocol, 592 (72.4%) three-day protocol. 673 (82.3%) of 812 injections were well tolerated 35 (4.3%) LIR Rx with oral antihistamines 71 (8.7%) subjective symptoms, 31 of whom Rx with oral or iv antihistamines 28 had objective anaphylaxis, 23 Grade I; 3 Grade 2; 2 Grade 4. Confirmation of safety of rush protocols. 3.4% rate of objective VIT-related anaphylaxis is low if we include subjective cases and then 12.1 % more in line with other studies	Severity of SR correlates with severity of index reaction according to Ring classification. 23 Grade I; 3 Grade II; 2 Grade III Isolated urticarial often developed 8 hours after the last injection, a case for hospitalization during up-dosing.
Hockenhull et al. (2012) A systematic review of the clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of Pharmalgen(R) for the treatment of bee and wasp venom allergy. Worldwide	SR RCTs Quasi-RCTs Health economic modelling	N = 9 n = 1065	Bee or wasp venom allergy	A systematic review of the clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of Pharmalgen for the treatment of bee and wasp venom allergy.	High	Evidence available poor but indicates reduction of future stings following the use of Pharmalgen VIT	Effectiveness of Pharmalgen for the treatment of bee and wasp venom allergy	
Secondary outcome: health economic analysis								

Table 2 Quality assessment of systematic reviews

Author (year)	Focused question	Inclusion of appropriate studies	Inclusion of eligible studies	Quality assessment of studies	Adequateness of synthesis	Overall results of review	Applicability to local populations	Considering all relevant outcomes	Benefits vs harms/costs	Overall quality assessment
Boyle (2012)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	High
Dhami (2013)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	High
Hockenhull (2012)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	High
Park (2015)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	Low
Watanabe (2010)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	High

Table 3 Quality assessment of RCTs and CBA original studies

Author (year)	Design	Adequate sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding/patient-related outcomes	Incomplete outcome data addressed	Free of selecting reporting	Free of other bias*	Overall quality assessment
Golden (2004)	CBA	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Low
Hunt (1978)	RCT	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Unclear	No	Low
Oude Elberink (2002)	Comprehensive cohort design includes an RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Moderate
Oude Elberink (2009)	Comprehensive cohort design includes an RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Moderate
Pasaoglu (2006)	CBA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Low
Reisman (1984)	CBA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Low
Schubert (1983)	Comprehensive cohort design includes an RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Moderate
Valentine (1990)	Comprehensive cohort design includes an RCT	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	No	Moderate/low

Table 4 Quality assessment of case series studies

Author (year)	Collected in more than one centre	Objective of the study clear	Clear reporting of inclusion/exclusion criteria	Clear definition of outcomes reported	Data prospectively collected	Were patients recruited consecutively	Clear description of main study findings	Are outcomes stratified	Score out of 8/quality
Brehler (2000)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	5/Low
Mosbech (2000)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8/Low
Rüeff (2010)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	6/Low
Stoevesandt (2014)	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	4/Low

subsequent systemic reactions to insect stings (risk ratio [RR] = 0.10, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.03–0.28). They also found that VIT prevented large local reactions to a sting (RR = 0.41, 95% CI 0.24–0.69).

The systematic review conducted by Dhami et al. (30) on the management of anaphylaxis studied the effectiveness of VIT in preventing venom-triggered anaphylaxis. This review included four systematic reviews (29, 31, 33, 50) and 23 individual studies of varying quality. It concluded that although much of the evidence is of a low quality, the evidence did consistently suggest that VIT can significantly reduce the risk of systemic reactions in subsequent stings.

The systematic review by Hockenhull et al. (31) concluded that VIT reduced the likelihood of future systemic reactions. This review assessed the clinical and cost-effectiveness of a specific brand of VIT: Pharmalgen (ALK-Abelló). The original search strategy was to look at the effectiveness of Pharmalgen (ALK-Abelló) vs other non-VIT treatments, but this had to be modified as no studies were found matching the original objective; they therefore widened the criteria to include other forms of Pharmalgen VIT administration protocols. The quality of trials included in the review was overall judged to be at high risk of bias. The review concluded that although the evidence was poor, it suggested that Pharmalgen VIT reduced the risk of future systemic reactions.

Watanabe et al. (33) carried out a high-quality systematic review looking at the effectiveness of VIT in patients who presented with a systemic reaction to insect stings. Four studies were included (34, 37, 38, 46) and a meta-analysis was performed, based on the Schuberth et al. and Valentine et al. studies, which demonstrated that there was a substantial reduction in the risk of systemic reactions occurring in children treated with VIT following an accidental sting (odds ratio (OR) = 0.29 (95% CI 0.10 < OR < 0.87)). The other two studies were judged to be at low risk of bias, but because of heterogeneity between studies they could not be included in the meta-analysis. Overall, this systematic review concluded that VIT was effective and should be recommended for adults with systemic reactions and for children with moderate-to-severe reactions, but not for children who only experienced cutaneous manifestations of a systemic reaction.

In summary, the evidence from these four systematic reviews suggests that VIT is effective in reducing subsequent systemic sting reactions in both children and adults; all four reviews have, however, highlighted the low quality of evidence that this conclusion is based on.

RCTs

Five RCTs also focussed on the effectiveness of VIT (34–38). Hunt et al.'s (34) study was a single-blind RCT of 59 patients aged 15–69 years investigating VIT vs whole-body extract (WBE) immunotherapy vs placebo; it was judged to be at high risk of bias. After 6–10 weeks of treatment, patients were randomly selected for a sting challenge. Of the 19 patients receiving VIT, 18 were stung with only one (5%) systemic reaction. The WBE and placebo groups each had 20 patients, from which 11 (55%) and 12 (60%) patients were stung, respectively. In both groups, there were seven systemic

sting reactions. There were significantly more systemic reactions to the sting challenge in the WBE and placebo groups when compared with the VIT group ($P < 0.01$). There was no difference in effectiveness between the WBE and placebo group. The authors concluded that VIT was superior to both WBE and placebo in preventing further systemic sting reactions and recommended the use of VIT to prevent life-threatening systemic sting reactions.

The two Oude Elberink et al. RCTs, which primarily looked at quality of life, also reported on re-sting rates. In both studies, they randomized patients to VIT or adrenaline auto-injector. In the 2002 study, two patients experienced a re-sting; one patient from the randomized control arm experienced a sting and developed a systemic reaction (1/38) which required use of an adrenaline auto-injector; one patient in the VIT group had a re-sting, but did not develop a systemic reaction. This patient was in the randomized VIT group (35). In the 2009 study, of 29 patients whose index sting reaction was confined to systemic cutaneous reactions, five patients experienced a field sting: three in the VIT group and two in the adrenaline auto-injector group. None of these five patients experienced a systemic sting reaction (36).

Schuberth et al. and Valentine et al. both looked at children with non-life-threatening sting reactions (37, 38). Both of these trials were judged to be at moderate risk of bias. They randomized children to VIT or no-VIT and studied systemic sting reactions to bees and wasps in those experiencing accidental stings. Schuberth et al. who looked at 181 children with systemic sting reactions limited to cutaneous manifestations found no statistical difference in the number of systemic sting reactions following an accidental sting in the VIT and no treatment group (35). They further found that no subsequent reaction was more severe than the original and in the no-VIT group of eight systemic reactions only one was as serious as the original. This led to their conclusion that children with primarily cutaneous manifestation to a sting were unlikely to experience a further systemic reaction following a re-sting. A total of 242 children were included in the Valentine et al.'s study. Of 45 children who experienced 55 stings, only one child in the VIT group experienced a systemic reaction to a field sting (1.8% systemic reactions/sting) compared to seven systemic reactions from 68 stings in 61 children who did not receive VIT (10.3% systemic reactions/sting) over a period of 4 years (RR = 0.21, 95% CI 0.03–1.66, $P = 0.14$) (36). Both studies concluded that VIT is not indicated in children with cutaneous manifestations only.

CBAs

The CBAs by Golden, Pasaoglu and Reisman et al. were all judged to be at moderate risk of bias (39–41). Golden et al. assessed the long-term effectiveness of VIT compared to no-VIT in preventing systemic sting reactions in 512 children (aged 10–20) after an average of 3.5 years of VIT treatment. They found a prolonged benefit in the treatment group as the VIT group experienced less systemic sting reactions (two of 64 patients, or 3%) than the untreated patients (19 of 111 patients, or 17%; $P = 0.007$) (39). This study suggested that VIT was effective in children with moderate-to-severe

reactions, but that VIT was not recommended in children who experienced mild reactions.

In contrast, the CBA by Pasaoglu et al. (40) looked at the effectiveness of a seven-day rush protocol of VIT in 18 patients. Seven received bee VIT, seven yellow jacket VIT and four were controls. Of the 14 patients who received VIT, two experienced accidental stings (including a bee keeper who had multiple stings). No systemic sting reactions occurred. They concluded that a seven-day rush protocol is effective.

The CBA by Reisman et al. (41) looked at children and adults with anaphylaxis to stings from honeybee or yellow jacket or bald-faced hornets or paper wasps. They looked at three groups and their subsequent reactions to accidental stings over a seven-year period: those who had VIT, those who started VIT, but stopped prematurely and those without VIT. The group that took VIT for the recommended duration (mean 34 months) had 87 re-stings with only two systemic reactions (1%). The group that stopped VIT prematurely (duration of VIT 1 month to 6.5 years) experienced 61 re-stings with 11 systemic reactions (17%). The group with no-VIT experienced 40 re-stings with 14 systemic reactions (35%). They concluded that VIT was almost 100% protective against subsequent sting-triggered anaphylaxis.

Meta-analysis of the Reisman and Golden et al.'s studies demonstrated an overall substantial protective effect of VIT against subsequent systemic reactions (OR = 0.08, 95% CI 0.03–0.26; see Fig. 3).

Impact on disease-specific quality of life

Systematic reviews

The systematic review by Boyle et al. (29) drew on two RCTs by Oude Elberink et al. (35, 47), the former of which is also included in this review and discussed below. This systematic review found that VIT was associated with a significant improvement in disease-specific quality of life after 1 year of VIT (RR = 7.11, 95% CI 3.02–16.71).

RCTs

Two RCTs assessed the impact of VIT on disease-specific quality of life measured using the Vespid allergy Quality of Life Questionnaire (VQLQ) (35, 36). Both of these studies looked at patients allergic to yellow jackets. The Oude Elberink et al.'s (36) RCT study looked at the impact on disease-specific quality of life in patients who had experienced only cutaneous manifestations of a systemic reaction; patients were randomized to VIT or an adrenaline auto-injector. The VQLQ score of patients in the VIT arm improved significantly (mean change 0.83 (SD 0.87); $P < 0.01$), in contrast to patients randomized to an adrenaline auto-injector whose scores deteriorated (mean change –0.42 (SD 0.64)), resulting in an overall risk difference of 1.25 (95% CI 0.63–1.87). The study suggested that all adults, including those who only had dermal reactions as a systemic allergic reaction to yellow jacket stings, should be considered for VIT and sole treatment with an adrenaline auto-injector should be avoided (36).




Figure 3 Meta-analysis of CBA studies investigating the effectiveness of VIT on risk of systemic sting reactions (random effects).

A similar earlier RCT (2002) by the same research team looked at disease-specific quality of life in patients who had experienced a systemic reaction after a yellow jacket sting that was not solely confined to the skin (35). The findings of this study were confirmed in their 2009 study, whereby there was a clinically relevant improvement in disease-specific quality of life in patients treated with VIT. The mean change in VQLQ score in the group randomized to VIT was 1.07 (95% CI, 0.68–1.46), and this improvement was also statistically significant ($P < 0.0001$) compared with that seen in the group randomized to the adrenaline auto-injector, in which this change was −0.43 (95% CI, −0.71 to −0.16) with a mean difference between the two groups of 1.51 (95% CI, 1.04–1.98). Of every three patients treated with VIT, two patients experienced a clinically relevant important improvement in their disease-specific quality of life. Overall, it was found that 72% of patients benefited from VIT, this corresponding to a number needed to treat (NNT) of 1.4. Meta-analysis of these studies demonstrated an improvement in disease-specific quality of life (1.41, 95% CI 1.04–1.79; see Fig. 4). The Begg test ($P = 0.317$) showed no evidence of publication bias.

Safety

Systematic reviews

The review by Boyle et al. (29) assessed the safety of VIT, six trials reported on this outcome. They concluded that VIT carries a small but significant risk of systemic reactions (RR = 8.16; 95% CI 1.53–43.46). They further looked at 11 observational studies for safety and found that systemic adverse events occurred in 14.2% of participants treated with bee venom VIT and 2.8% of those treated with wasp venom VIT.

The systematic review by Park et al., which was assessed as of a low quality, looked at identifying the frequency and types of adverse events associated with different types of bee venom therapy; in doing so, they included VIT, but also acupuncture (32). It included 145 studies consisting of 20 RCTs, 79 audits and cohort studies, 33 single case studies and 13 case series. Two RCTs on VIT were included (35, 47), one of which we have included in this review (2002), and 63

case series/cohort studies. From 46 VIT case series/cohort studies, the median incidence of adverse events was 28.9%. Of these, 50.4% had systemic reactions and 10.0% large local reactions; 35.8% showed just local reactions and 3.9% had ‘other’ reactions.

RCTs

Of the RCTs included in this review, two reported very limited information on safety considerations of VIT and this is included in Table 2 (34, 36).

CBA

The CBA conducted by Pasaoglu et al. evaluated the safety of a rush VIT protocol lasting on average 7 days and monitored for local and systemic reactions during both the induction and maintenance phases of VIT treatment over a one-year period. The study concluded that rush VIT was safe and associated with a low risk of systemic reactions (four systemic reactions from a total of 469 injections, this equating to a 0.85% risk per total number of injections) and that this treatment approach could therefore be considered for patients requiring rapid protection such as those with a high risk of subsequent stings (e.g. bee keepers and their families). The risk of systemic reaction to VIT was related to the type of venom used with vespidae venom being better tolerated than bee venom (40).

Case series

Four large case series (i.e. Brehler, Mosbech, Ruëff and Stoevesandt et al.) met our eligibility criteria. The Brehler et al.’s study looked at the safety implication of shortening the seven-to nine-day rush protocol to 2 days as well as increasing the initial dose of venom administered. No anaphylactic reactions were seen in 1055 VIT treatments in 966 patients; most adverse events were mild and none needed treatment with adrenaline. Overall, they concluded the two-day rush protocol is safe and the risk of systemic reactions is rare when the number of injections administered is reduced from 20 subcutaneous injections to nine (42). The Mosbech et al.’s case series included 840 patients, was conducted in 10 European countries and assessed the safety of VIT in both the build-up and maintenance phases in patients allergic to honeybees, wasps




Figure 4 Meta-analysis of RCTs investigating the effectiveness of VIT on VQLQ (random effects).

and paper wasps (45). Treatment protocols were not standardized across centres, and conventional, rush and cluster protocols were used. A total of 782 patients received VIT with one venom and 58 with two venoms, respectively. A total of 26 601 injections were administered and 299 systemic side-effects occurred (1.2% of injections). Most of these reactions were mild based on the Mueller grading scale (51) with only one-third needing treatment. One patient required adrenaline. Adverse events were more frequent during the dose-increase phase than during the maintenance phase (mean: 1.9% vs 0.5% of all injections). Other factors were identified that resulted in an increase in adverse events. These included female gender, rapid dose-increase regimens and VIT with bee venom extract. They concluded that systemic side-effects may occur in up to 20% of patients, but are usually mild.

The Ruëff et al.'s case series looked at measuring the severity of reactions according to the Ring and Meßmer (52) tool during the build-up phase of VIT, which required emergency intervention. They evaluated 680 patients in which VIT was delivered using the following protocols; conventional, rush and ultra-rush protocols for bee and vespid immunotherapy. The study identified a number of risk factors that led to a higher frequency of adverse events requiring emergency intervention during VIT; these included bee venom immunotherapy and using rush and ultra-rush protocols. The authors concluded that patients receiving bee VIT warrant closer monitoring than those patients receiving VIT to other insects (43).

Stoevesandt et al. looked at the incidence of systemic reactions during 818 build-up cycles (rush five-day or ultra-rush three-day inpatient treatment protocol), and the severity of VIT-related anaphylaxis was graded according to the WAO classification system (20). The data from this study indicated that rush protocols were safe with very low numbers of patients suffering from moderate-to-severe systemic anaphylaxis (i.e. 673 (82.3%) of 818 documented build-up cycles were tolerated without complications). However, the authors acknowledged that due to low numbers of moderate-to-severe anaphylaxis reactions (0.8% of patients in the total cohort), robust statistical conclusions could not be drawn (44).

Health economic analysis

We found only one study, the review by Hockenhull et al. (31), that looked at the economic evaluation of VIT – a modelling study looking at the cost-effectiveness of VIT for the treatment of bee and wasp venom allergy. The study compared VIT with Pharmalgen plus high-dose H₁-antihistamines plus adrenaline auto-injectors (AAI) vs high-dose H₁-antihistamines plus adrenaline auto-injectors and avoidance advice only. It found that VIT was not cost-effective in the general population (incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICERs) of £18 million and £7.6 million per quality-adjusted life year (QALY) against high-dose H₁-antihistamines plus AAI and avoidance advice only, respectively), but more effective than other treatment options and cost saving in patients likely to be stung more than five times per year such as bee keepers. This one study, despite the fact that it was based largely on expert opinion and plausible assumptions, resulted in the suggestion that VIT for bee and wasp venom allergy is only cost-effective from a UK National Health Service (NHS) perspective for very high-risk groups likely to be exposed to multiple exposures to venom per year such as bee keepers. The modelling analysis suggests plausible ranges of exposure to such events to qualify a patient as a member of a high-risk group and explores a wide range of sensitivity and scenario analyses to demonstrate the robustness of its findings.

We were unable to find any primary studies assessing the cost-effectiveness of VIT for venom allergy.

Discussion

Statement of principal findings

This systematic review has found a modest body of evidence of moderate quality, which suggests that VIT is effective in reducing subsequent severe systemic sting reactions in both children and adults and that this treatment modality can have a significant beneficial impact on disease-specific quality of life when compared with carrying an adrenaline auto-injector. The available data on the safety of VIT suggest that although

adverse events occurred during both the build-up and maintenance phases, the vast majority were relatively mild with adrenaline only being needed very infrequently and – importantly – no fatalities being recorded. We found no primary evidence on the cost-effectiveness of VIT; the one modelling study found that VIT would be cost-effective in high-risk groups or if disease-specific quality of life was taken into consideration.

Strengths and limitations

There are a number of strengths to this systematic review. In particular, we searched a broad array of databases for published and in progress research, and also consulted with a panel of international experts in an attempt to identify unpublished evidence. Furthermore, our systematic review was conducted according to a predefined, published protocol with no deviations from this (10).

The limitations of this review also need to be considered. Key here was the limited number of studies identified, despite the fact that we also included CBAs. The review is further limited by the low quality of the primary studies. Furthermore, two of the RCTs included in this systematic review (i.e. Valentine and Schubert) excluded patients who had life-threatening systemic reactions to the initial sting – the group of patients who would be most likely to benefit from VIT (36, 37). Furthermore, it should be noted that in both of these studies, the definitive identification of the culprit insect responsible for the accidental sting was not possible. Thus, whether the child was stung by the insect responsible for the index sting which resulted in a systemic reaction was unknown. This is in contrast to the Hunt trial in which patients were sting-challenged by the insect they were known to be allergic to (35). As this review did not include the jack jumper species of ants, the double-blind placebo-controlled RCT by Brown et al. (46) could not be included in this review. This study concluded that VIT significantly reduces the risk of serious subsequent sting reactions from the jack jumper ant ($P < 0.0001$). Only one study assessed the cost-effectiveness of VIT and this was limited to looking only at one product and based on an economic modelling analysis (31). Finally, as with any systematic review, there is the possibility that we missed some studies.

Interpreting the results of this review in the context of the wider literature

In undertaking this systematic review, we sought to identify all relevant previous systematic reviews. Our findings are broadly in accordance with these previous reviews, namely that VIT is beneficial, but that this judgement is limited by the paucity and quality of the relevant evidence base. Guidelines for the long-term management of allergic reactions to venom advocate the use of VIT in patients who have experienced moderate-to-severe systemic reactions (53, 54). In agreement with our findings, VIT is not recommended in children whose index reaction was confined to cutaneous manifestations. SLIT remains an experimental treatment in VIT; no SLIT studies satisfied our eligibility criteria.

Implications for policy, practice and research

The results of our review indicate that people who experience moderate-to-severe systemic reactions to venom are likely to benefit from treatment with VIT. This benefit consists of a reduction in the frequency and severity of subsequent systemic reactions following future stings and/or a clinically relevant improvement in disease-specific quality of life. We found very limited evidence on the cost-effectiveness of VIT for venom allergy which thus needs to be interpreted cautiously; the available evidence, from a single economic modelling study, indicated that VIT is likely to be cost-effective in patients at high risk of future sting reactions and/or if quality of life is impaired.

Given the paucity of high-quality evidence uncovered, consideration needs to be given to undertaking high-quality studies investigating the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of VIT. RCTs in both adults and children would be of interest, but due to the risk of life-threatening reactions in untreated patients, RCTs may not be considered ethical by some clinicians and furthermore they may not be approved by some ethics committees. It seems unlikely therefore that there will be further placebo-controlled trials of VIT preparations in the foreseeable future. As for VIT regimens, at present many protocols for VIT are used discretionally at treatment centres with varying build-up and maintenance doses with no defined duration of treatment. These protocols vary from conventional (12 weeks) to one-day ultra-rush protocols during the build-up phase. Time taken to reach the maintenance dose will be dependent on the build-up phase and varies across centres. Trials should therefore be considered comparing different VIT regimens, doses and durations of VIT. Whether trials of SLIT for venom allergy are indicated is debated (55). More standard reporting of VIT-associated adverse events is needed in order to allow comparison across studies. Primary studies of cost-effectiveness are also needed.

Conclusions

The limited available evidence suggests that VIT is effective in reducing subsequent severe systemic sting reactions and in improving disease-specific quality of life. VIT proved to be safe and no fatalities were recorded in the studies included in this review. The cost-effectiveness of VIT needs to be established.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by AK-Artemisia Karakou. We thank the panel of experts who helped with the identification of relevant studies and Zakariya Sheikh for technical support.

Conflicts of interest

¹Sangeeta Dhami reports grants from EAACI, during the conduct of the study; ²Hadar Zaman has nothing to disclose;

³Eva-Maria Varga has nothing to disclose; ⁴Gunter J Sturm reports grants and personal fees from ALK Abello, personal fees from Novartis, personal fees from Stallergens, personal

fees from Bencard Allergy, personal fees from Leti, outside the submitted work; ⁵Antonella Muraro reports personal fees from Novartis, personal fees from Meda Mylan, outside the submitted work; ⁶Cezmi Akdis reports grants from Actellion, personal fees from Aventis, personal fees from Stallergenes, grants and personal fees from Allergopharma, personal fees from Circassia, grants from Novartis, grants from Christine Kuhne Center for Allergy Research and Education, outside the submitted work; ⁷Dario Antolín-Amérigo reports having participated in the following: Advisory board (Merck, Novartis, Sandoz), Medical expert of the ALK web for general public (ALK-Abelló), research grant (Merck-Serono-Fundación 2000), clinical trials (Diater Laboratorios, Stallergenes), educational grants (Merck, Pfizer), speaker (Allergy Therapeutics, GlaxoSmithKline, AstraZeneca, Merck, Stallergenes), honoraria for articles (Ferrer Laboratorios, Meda, Stallergenes); ⁸Beatrice Bilò has nothing to disclose; ⁹Danijela Bokanovic has nothing to disclose; ¹⁰Moises A Calderon has received honorarium in Advisory Boards for ALK and Hal-Allergy, as speaker for ALK, Merck and Stallergenes-Greer; ¹¹Ewa Cichocka-Jarosz has nothing to disclose; ¹²Joanna N.G. Oude Elberink reports grants from ALK Abello, during the conduct of the study; ¹³Radoslaw Gawlik has nothing to disclose; ¹⁴Thilo Jakob reports non-financial support from German Society of Allergy Clinical Immunology, personal fees from Allergo Journal International, personal fees from ALK Abello, Germany, personal fees from Allergy therapeutics, grants and personal fees from Allergopharma, personal fees from Novartis, personal fees from Leti GmbH, grants and personal fees from Thermo Fisher Scientific, personal fees from Stallergenes, outside the submitted work; ¹⁵Mitja Kosnik has nothing to disclose; ¹⁶Joanna Lange has nothing to disclose; ¹⁷Ervin Mingomataj has nothing to disclose; ¹⁸Dimitris I Mitsias has nothing to disclose; ¹⁹Holger Mosbech reports personal fees from ALK, outside the submitted work; ²⁰Markus Ollert reports personal fees from Thermo Fisher, outside the submitted work; and Co-Founder of the Biotech Start-up PLS-Design GmbH, Hamburg, Germany in 2004; ²¹²²Oliver Pfaar reports grants and personal fees from ALK Abelló, grants and personal fees from Allergopharma, grants and personal fees from Stallergenes-Greer, grants, personal fees and non-financial support from HAL-Allergy Holding B.V./HAL-Allergie gmbh, grants and personal fees from Bencard Allergie gmbh, grants and personal fees from Lofarma, grants from Biomay, grants from Nuvo, grants from Circassia, grants and personal fees from Biotech Tools S.A., grants and personal fees from Laboratorios LETI / LETI Pharma, grants and personal fees from Novartis Pharma, personal fees from MEDA Pharma, personal fees from Anergis S.A., personal fees from Sanofi-

Aventis, personal fees from Mobile Chamber Experts (a GA2LEN Partner), personal fees from Pohl-Boskamp, grants and personal fees from Allergy Therapeutics, outside the submitted work; and Pfaar is the current chairman of the Immunotherapy Interest Group (IT IG) of the European Academy of Allergy and Clinical Immunology (EAACI) and the secretary of the ENT section of the German Society for Allergology and Clinical Immunology (DGAKI) and chairman or member of different guideline-/task force initiatives of EAACI and DGAKI; ²³Constantinos Pitsios has nothing to disclose; ²⁴Valerio Pravettoni has nothing to disclose; ²⁵Graham Roberts reports a patent use of sublingual immunotherapy to prevent the development of allergy in at risk infants. issued and My University has received payments for activities I have undertaken giving expert advice to ALK, presenting at company symposia for ALK, Allergen Therapeutics and Meda plus as a member of an Independent Data Monitoring Committee for Merck; ²⁶Franziska Ruëff has participated in clinical studies for Novartis, HAL, ALK-Abello, has received financial support for a non-interventional study from Novartis, was paid lecturer for HAL, ALK-Abello, Astra Zeneca, Novartis and a advisor for Bencard, Dr. Gerhard Mann chem.-pharm. Fabrik GmbH, Novartis, Stallergenes and ALK-Abello. These activities do not cause a conflict of interest and have no influence on the paper. ²⁷Betül Ayşe Sin has nothing to disclose; ²⁸Miqdad Asaria has nothing to disclose; ²⁹Gopal Netuveli has nothing to disclose; ³⁰Aziz Sheikh reports grants from EAACI, during the conduct of the study.

Funding

EAACI and Grant agreement no: 601763.

Author contributions

This manuscript was drafted by S Dhami and H Zaman; it was revised following critical review initially by A Sheikh, E-M Varga and G Sturm and then by all the co-authors. This manuscript is part of the EAACI AIT guidelines project, chaired by Antonella Muraro and coordinated by Graham Roberts.

Supporting Information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

- Appendix S1.** Search strategy.
- Appendix S2.** Experts consulted.
- Appendix S3.** PRISMA checklist.

References

1. Golden DB. Anaphylaxis to insect stings. *Immunol Allergy Clin North Am* 2015;**35**:287–302.
2. Novembre E, Cianferoni A, Bernardini RA, Ingargiola A, Lombardi E, Vierucci A. Epidemiology of insect venom sensitivity in children and its correlation to clinical and atopic features. *Clin Exp Allergy* 1998;**28**: 834–838.
3. Clark S, Camargo CA Jr. Epidemiology of anaphylaxis. *Immunol Allergy Clin North Am* 2007;**27**:145–163.
4. Liew WK, Williamson E, Tang ML. Anaphylaxis fatalities and admissions in

- Australia. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2009; **123**: 434–442.
5. Pumphrey RS. Lessons for management of anaphylaxis from a study of fatal reactions. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2000; **30**: 1144–1150.
 6. Bilò MB, Cichocka-Jarosz E, Pumphrey R, Oude-Elberink JN, Lange J, Jakob T et al. Self-medication of anaphylactic reactions due to Hymenoptera stings – an EAACI Task Force Consensus Statement. *Allergy* 2016; **71**: 931–943.
 7. Krishna MT, Ewan PM, Diwakar L, Durham SR, Frew AJ, Leech SC et al. Diagnosis and management of hymenoptera venom allergy: British Society for Allergy and Clinical Immunology (BSACI) guidelines. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2011; **41**: 1201–1220.
 8. Stritzke AI, Eng PA. Age-dependent sting recurrence and outcome in immunotherapy-treated children with anaphylaxis to Hymenoptera venom. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2013; **43**: 950–955.
 9. Bilò BM, Bonifazi F. Epidemiology of insect-venom anaphylaxis. *Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol* 2008; **8**: 330.
 10. Dhami S, Nurmatov U, Varga EM, Sturm G, Muraro A, Akdis CA et al. Allergen immunotherapy for insect venom allergy: protocol for a systematic review. *Clin Transl Allergy* 2016; **6**: 6.
 11. Dhami S, Nurmatov U, Roberts G, Pfaar O, Muraro A, Ansotegui IJ et al. Allergen immunotherapy for allergic rhinoconjunctivitis: protocol for a systematic review. *Clin Transl Allergy* 2016; **6**: 12.
 12. Dhami S, Nurmatov U, Pajno GB, Fernández-Rivas M, Muraro A, Roberts G et al. Allergen immunotherapy for IgE-mediated food allergy: protocol for a systematic review. *Clin Transl Allergy* 2016; **6**: 24.
 13. Dhami S, Nurmatov U, Agache I, Lau S, Muraro A, Jutel M et al. Allergen immunotherapy for allergic asthma: protocol for a systematic review. *Clin Transl Allergy* 2016; **6**: 5.
 14. Dhami S, Nurmatov U, Halken S, Calderón MA, Muraro A, Roberts G et al. Allergen immunotherapy for the prevention of allergic disease: protocol for a systematic review. *Pediatr Allergy Immunol* 2016; **27**: 236–241.
 15. Higgins JPT, Green S, editors. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011. Available at: <http://training.cochrane.org/handbook> Last accessed on 26 November 2016
 16. EPOC Group. Available at: <http://epoc-cochrane.org/literature-searching-systematic-reviews>
 17. Cochrane Effective Practice & Organisation of Care (EPOC) Group. Personal communication Michelle Fiander, Information Specialist & Trial Search Co-ordinator. Ottawa, ON, Canada: EPOC; 2012.
 18. Bilò BM, Bonifazi F. Hymenoptera venom immunotherapy. *Immunotherapy* 2011; **3**: 229–246.
 19. Effective Practice and Organization of Care Group. What study designs should be included in an EPOC review and what should they be called. Available at: <http://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc-cochrane.org/files/uploads/EPOC%20Study%20Designs%20About.pdf> (Accessed on 11 November 2015).
 20. Passalacqua G, Baena-Cagnani CE, Bousquet J, Canonica GW, Casale TB, Cox L et al. Grading local side effects of sublingual immunotherapy for respiratory allergy: speaking the same language. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2013; **132**: 93–98.
 21. World Allergy Organization Subcutaneous Immunotherapy Systemic Reaction Grading System. Available at: <https://www.aaaai.org/Aaaai/media/MediaLibrary/PDF%20Documents/Immunotherapy%20Forms/7b-World-Allergy-Organization-Systemic-Reaction-Grading-systemx.pdf>
 22. CASP Checklist for Systematic Reviews. Available at: http://media.wix.com/ugd/dded87_a02ff2e3445f4952992d5a96-ca562576.pdf
 23. Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Group. EPOC Website. Available at: <http://epoc.cochrane.org/epoc-specific-resources-review-authors>
 24. The Cochrane Collaboration's Tool for Assessing Risk of Bias. Available at: http://handbook.cochrane.org/chapter_8/table_8_5_a_the_cochrane_collaborations_tool_for_assessing.htm
 25. Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Group. Methods papers. Available at: <http://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/uploads/baseline.pdf>
 26. Higgins JPT, Green S. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. Version 5.0.2 (Chapter 11, Section 11). The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011
 27. Bonadonna P, Bonifacio M, Lombardo C, Zanotti R. Hymenoptera allergy and mast cell activation syndromes. *R Curr Allergy Asthma Rep* 2016; **16**: 5.
 28. Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. *Biometrics* 1994; **50**: 1088–1101.
 29. Boyle RJ, Elremeli M, Hockenhull J, Cherry MG, Bulsara MK, Daniels M et al. Venom immunotherapy for preventing allergic reactions to insect stings (Review). *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012; **10**: CD008838.
 30. Dhami S, Panesar SS, Roberts G, Muraro A, Worm M, Bilò MB et al. Management of anaphylaxis: a systematic review. *Allergy* 2014; **69**: 168–175.
 31. Hockenhull JE, Iremeli M, Cherry MG, Mahon J, Lai M, Darroch J et al. A systematic review of the clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of Pharmalgen® for the treatment of bee and wasp venom allergy. *Health Technol Assess* 2012; **16**: III–IV, 1–110.
 32. Park JH, Yim BK, Lee J-H, Lee S, Kim T-H. Risk associated with bee venom therapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2015; **10**: e0126971.
 33. Watanabe ASA, Fonseca L, Galvão C, Kalil J, Castro F. Specific immunotherapy using Hymenoptera venom: systematic review (Imunoterapia específica com venenos de Hymenoptera: revisão sistemática). *Sao Paulo Med J* 2010; **128**: 30–37.
 34. Hunt KJ, Valentine MD, Sobotka AK, Benton AW, Amodio FJ, Lichtenstein LM. A controlled trial of immunotherapy in insect hypersensitivity. *N Engl J Med* 1978; **299**: 157–161.
 35. Oude Elberink JO, De Monchy JGR, Van Der Heide S, Guyatt GH, Dubois AEJ. Venom immunotherapy improves health-related quality of life in patients allergic to yellow jacket venom. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2002; **110**: 174–182.
 36. Oude Elberink JO, van der Heide S, Guyatt GH, Dubois AEJ. Immunotherapy improves health-related quality of life of adult patients with dermal reactions following yellow jacket stings. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2009; **39**: 883–889.
 37. Schubert KC, Lichtenstein LM, Kagey-Sobotka A, Szkołko M, Kwiterovich K, Valentine MD. Epidemiologic study of insect allergy in II. Effect of accidental stings in allergic children. *J Pediatr* 1983; **102**: 361–365.
 38. Valentine MD, Schubert K, Kagey-Sobotka A, Graft D, Kwiterovich K, Szkołko M et al. The value of immunotherapy with venom in children with allergy to insect stings. *N Engl J Med* 1990; **323**: 1601–1603.
 39. Golden DB, Kagey-Sobotka A, Norman PS, Hamilton RG, Lichtenstein LM. Outcomes of allergy to insect stings in children, with and without venom immunotherapy. *N Engl J Med* 2004; **351**: 668–674.
 40. Pasaoglu G, Sin BA, Misirligil Z. Rush hymenoptera venom immunotherapy is efficacious and safe. *J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol* 2006; **16**: 232–238.
 41. Reisman RE, Dvorin DD, Randolph CC, Georgitis JW. Stinging insect allergy: natural history and modification with venom immunotherapy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1985; **75**: 735–740.
 42. Brehler R, Wolf H, Küting B, Schnitker J, Luger T. Safety of a two-day ultrarush insect venom immunotherapy protocol in comparison with protocols of longer duration and involving a larger number of

- injections. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2000; **105**:1231–1235.
43. Ruëff F, Przybilla B, Bilò MB, Müller U, Scheipl F, Aberer W et al. Predictors of side effects during the buildup phase of venom immunotherapy for Hymenoptera venom allergy: the importance of baseline serum tryptase. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2010; **126**:105–111.
 44. Stoevesandt J, Hosp C, Kerstan A, Trautmann A. Risk stratification of systemic allergic reactions during Hymenoptera venom immunotherapy build-up phase. *J Dtsch Dermatol Ges* 2014; **12**:244–256.
 45. Mosbech H, Mueller U. Side-effects of insect venom immunotherapy: results from an EAACI multicenter study. *Allergy* 2000; **55**:1005–1010.
 46. Brown SG, Wiese MD, Blackman KE, Heddle RJ. Ant venom immunotherapy: a double-blind, placebo-controlled, crossover trial. *Lancet* 2003; **361**:1001–1006.
 47. Oude Elberink JN, van der Heide S, Guyatt GH, Dubois AE. Analysis of the burden of treatment in patients receiving an EpiPen for yellow jacket anaphylaxis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2006; **118**:699–704.
 48. Golden DB, Kelly D, Hamilton RG, Craig TJ. Venom immunotherapy reduces large local reactions to insect stings. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2009; **123**:1371–1375.
 49. Severino MG, Cortellini G, Bonadonna P, Francescato E, Panzini I, Macchia D et al. Sublingual immunotherapy for large local reactions caused by honeybee sting: a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2008; **122**:44–48.
 50. Ross R, Nelson H, Finegold I. Effectiveness of specific immunotherapy in the treatment of hymenoptera venom hypersensitivity: a meta-analysis. *Clin Ther* 2000; **22**:351–358.
 51. Mueller grading scale. Available at: <http://www.gpnotebook.co.uk/simplepage.cfm?ID=x20120321132301331321> Last accessed on 7 December 2016
 52. Ring J, Meßmer K. Incidence and severity of anaphylactoid reactions to colloid volume substitutes. *Lancet* 1977; **1**:466–469.
 53. Bonifazi F, Jutel M, Bilò MB, Birnbaum J, Müller U, Bucher C et al. EAACI position paper prevention and treatment of hymenoptera venom allergy. Available at: http://www.eaaci.org/attachments/887_Hymenoptera%20PP%20-%20Prevention%20&%20Treatment%20%28Part%20II%29.pdf
 54. Golden D, Moffitt J, Nicklas R. Stinging insect hypersensitivity: a practice parameter update. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2011; **127**:852–854.
 55. Ruëff F, Bilò MB, Jutel M, Mosbech H, Müller U, Przybilla B; Interest group on Hymenoptera venom allergy of the European Academy of Allergology and Clinical Immunology. Sublingual immunotherapy with venom is not recommended for patients with Hymenoptera venom allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2009; **123**:272–273.