

1 **A safe and efficient 7-week immunotherapy protocol with aluminum hydroxide**  
2 **adsorbed bee venom**

3  
4 Lisa Arzt-Gradwohl, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Urban Čerpes, MD<sup>1</sup>, Eva Schadelbauer, MD<sup>1</sup>, Clemes Schöffl,  
5 MD<sup>1</sup>, Sereina Annik Herzog, PhD<sup>2</sup>, Christoph Schrautzer, MD<sup>1</sup>, Danijela Bokanovic, MD<sup>1</sup>,  
6 Lukas Koch, MD<sup>1</sup>, Karin Laipold, BSc<sup>1</sup>, Barbara Binder, MD<sup>1</sup>, Gunter J Sturm, MD, PhD<sup>1,3</sup>

7  
8 <sup>1</sup> Department of Dermatology and Venereology, Medical University of Graz, Austria

9 <sup>2</sup> Institute for Medical Informatics, Statistics and Documentation, Medical University of Graz,  
10 Austria

11 <sup>3</sup> Allergy Outpatient Clinic Reumannplatz, Vienna, Austria

12

13 Correspondence to: Assoz.-Prof. Gunter Sturm, MD, PhD

14 Department of Dermatology and Venereology

15 Medical University of Graz

16 Auenbruggerplatz 8

17 A – 8036 Graz

18 Phone: +43/316/385-80318

19 Fax: +43/316/385-12466

20 Email: [gunter.sturm@medunigraz.at](mailto:gunter.sturm@medunigraz.at)

21

22 **Source of funding:** This study was supported by the Austrian Science Fund (Grant-DOI:  
23 10.55776/KLI836) and by an unrestricted grant from ALK Abelló, Hørsholm, Denmark.

24 **Conflicts of interest:** Dr. Sturm reports grants from ALK-Abelló, personal fees from ALK-  
25 Abelló, personal fees from Allergopharma, personal fees from Novartis, and personal fees

26 from Stallergenes-Greer, outside the submitted work. All other authors have no conflicts of  
27 interest to declare.

28 **Keywords**

29 accelerated up-dosing protocol; Hymenoptera venom allergy; sting challenge; systemic  
30 reaction; depot bee venom immunotherapy;

31 **To the Editor:**

32 Systemic anaphylactic reactions to Hymenoptera stings are reported to occur in 3.3% of the  
33 general Austrian population. Therapy adherence remains a significant challenge<sup>1</sup>, despite the  
34 proven efficacy of venom immunotherapy (VIT) as a causal treatment. VIT provides protection  
35 from future systemic sting reactions (SSR) in 77–84% of patients treated with honeybee venom  
36 and 91–96% of those treated with vespid venom.<sup>2</sup>

37 Adverse events (AE) are usually rare and mild, and symptoms occur in only 4.3-11.4% of  
38 patients during up-dosing.<sup>3</sup> A variety of therapy regimes exists for the up-dosing phase, from  
39 conventional to rush and ultrarush or clustered protocols.<sup>2</sup> Current conventional protocols are  
40 still time-consuming for patients. Therefore, we initiated a prospective clinical trial (EudraCT  
41 2015-002769-44) evaluating the safety and efficacy of an accelerated up-dosing protocol with  
42 8 weekly injections in 7 weeks using the purified depot preparation Alutard SQ® bee venom  
43 (ALK Abelló, Hørsholm, Denmark). External monitoring was performed during the clinical  
44 trial for the purpose of quality assurance.

45 Seventy-six patients aged 18-70 years with a history of a SSR to bee stings ( $\geq$  grade I,  
46 classification of Ring and Messmer<sup>4</sup>) were included (details see supplementary material S1).  
47 To demonstrate VIT efficacy, sting challenges with living bees (*Apis mellifera*) were  
48 performed, whenever possible, already one week after reaching the maintenance dose.

49 Two patients withdrew from the study at their request. Venom immunotherapy could not be  
50 initiated in one patient due to a medical contraindication, while the remaining 73 patients  
51 successfully completed the up-dosing phase. Seven patients (9.6%, CI 0.00-18.76) showed  
52 objective symptoms which were mild to moderate, and two (2.7%, CI 0.00-9.55) additional  
53 patients developed subjective systemic reactions (SR; see Table 1 and 2). Nineteen patients  
54 (26.0%) experienced large local reactions (LLR; see Table 1), the majority just once or twice.  
55 Elevated ( $>11.4\mu\text{g/L}$ ) tryptase levels ( $p=0.330$ ), age  $>40$  years ( $p>0.999$ ), the prevalence of

56 cardiovascular diseases ( $p=0.636$ ) or antihypertensive treatment ( $p>0.999$ ) were not related to  
57 the occurrence of SR.

58 Six patients (8.2%) experienced field stings from bees during the up-dosing phase; one of them  
59 developed an exanthema and palmar pruritus ten minutes after the sting, all others tolerated the  
60 sting. A total of 71 sting challenges were conducted after patients reached the maintenance  
61 dose, with 56 patients (78.9%) successfully tolerating the sting. Fifty-six patients returned to  
62 the clinic for the first annual check-up. Three patients (5.4%) reported a SR after VIT during  
63 the first year of the maintenance phase, exhibiting both, subjective and objective symptoms.  
64 Twenty-two patients (39.3%) reported field stings, all without any systemic sting reaction.

65 Adverse events appear to occur less frequently during up-dosing in conventional protocols  
66 compared to faster protocols.<sup>2</sup> However, reaching the maintenance dose in conventional  
67 protocols takes a considerable amount of time, leaving patients potentially unprotected for  
68 several months. Our objective was to achieve an optimal balance between rapid up-dosing and  
69 safety, with a strong emphasis on the latter. Notably, only 9.6% of patients in our study cohort  
70 experienced objective systemic adverse events during the up-dosing phase.

71 In the meantime, our published protocol for vespid venom has also been applied to bee venom  
72 by another group, though only in 16 patients.<sup>5</sup> Additionally, rush and cluster protocols using  
73 depot extracts have been published.<sup>6,7</sup> A common limitation of all these studies is that their  
74 design is underpowered to thoroughly evaluate the safety of bee venom immunotherapy.  
75 Moreover, our study is the only one to demonstrate efficacy through controlled sting challenges  
76 rather than relying on field sting evaluations. After reaching the maintenance dose of 100  $\mu$ g,  
77 78.9% of our patients tolerated the sting, aligning with the expected efficacy range of 77–84%.  
78 Our study demonstrated in a substantial cohort of bee venom-allergic patients that the 7-week  
79 outpatient protocol is safe and effective. This will, hopefully, result in improved acceptance of  
80 VIT.

81 **Tables**

82 **Table 1:** Demographic data and medical history (n=75) as well as frequency of adverse events  
 83 (large local and systemic reactions) during up-dosing and maintenance phases.

Age range (median age) [years]	18-69 (37)
Sex	
- male	33 (44.0%)
- female	42 (56.0%)
Antihypertensive treatment	8 (10.7%)
- ACE inhibitor	4 (5.3%)
- Beta-blocker	5 (6.7%)
- ACE-inhibitor and beta-blocker	1 (1.3%)
Grade of SR (index sting) *	
- I°	10 (13.3%)
- II°	52 (69.3%)
- III°	13 (17.3%)
- IV°	0 (0.0%)
Up-dosing phase (n=73)	
- no side effect	49 (67.1%)
- large local reaction	19 (26.0%)
- objective systemic symptoms	7 (9.6%)
- only subjective systemic symptoms	2 (2.7%)
Sting challenge test (n=71)	
- sting tolerated	56 (78.9%)
- systemic reaction after sting	15 (21.1%)

84  
 85 \*according to the classification of Ring & Messmer<sup>4</sup>

86  
87

**Table 2:** Objective, systemic reactions during the up-dosing phase of venom immunotherapy.

Patient ID	Age	Sex	Reactions (n)	Grade*	Objective symptoms	Dose of last injection [µg]	Symptoms	Treatment
52	47	female	2	II; II	no	10; 60	vertigo; vertigo, globus sensation	oral antihistamine (2nd reaction)
72	37	male	3	I; I; I	no	5; 20; 40	paresthesia palmar/plantar (all three times)	no
19	39	female	1	I	yes	60	urticaria, pruritus	no
35	59	male	1	I	yes	40	flush	oral antihistamine
38	31	female	2	II; II	yes	1; 5	vertigo; vertigo, nausea, angioedema	antihistamine intravenous (2nd reaction)
47	24	female	1	II	yes	40	abdominal cramping, shivering, cold sweating	antihistamine (oral and iv.),metamizol-natrium, butylscopolamin, NaCl
53	48	female	1	I	yes	100	palmar pruritus and erythema	oral antihistamine
54	31	female	2	I; I	yes	60; 100	palmar pruritus and erythema; palmar pruritus and erythema, urticaria	oral antihistamine; oral antihistamine and corticosteroid iv.
61	64	male	1	I	yes	20	flush	oral antihistamine

88  
89

\*according to the classification of Ring & Messmer<sup>4</sup>

90 **References**

91

- 92 1. Bokanovic D, Aberer W, Griesbacher A, Sturm GJ. Prevalence of hymenoptera venom  
93 allergy and poor adherence to immunotherapy in Austria. *Allergy*. 2011;66(10):1395-  
94 1396.
- 95 2. Sturm GJ, Varga EM, Roberts G, et al. EAACI guidelines on allergen immunotherapy:  
96 Hymenoptera venom allergy. *Allergy*. 2018;73(4):744-764.
- 97 3. Rueff F, Przybilla B, Bilo MB, et al. Predictors of side effects during the buildup  
98 phase of venom immunotherapy for Hymenoptera venom allergy: the importance of  
99 baseline serum tryptase. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2010;126(1):105-111 e105.
- 100 4. Ring J, Messmer K. Incidence and severity of anaphylactoid reactions to colloid  
101 volume substitutes. *Lancet*. 1977;1(8009):466-469.
- 102 5. Kasternow B, Kim DS, Yong PFK. Efficacy and safety of a 7-week immunotherapy  
103 protocol with aluminium hydroxide adsorbed hymenoptera venom. *Allergy*. 2024.
- 104 6. Cadavid-Moreno S, Gonzalez-Fernandez T, Mendez-Brea P, Armisen M, Vidal C. A  
105 Clustered Schedule for Venom Immunotherapy With a Depot Extract: Reaching the  
106 Target in 7 Days. *J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol*. 2023;33(5):395-397.
- 107 7. Pucci S, Ciccarelli F, De Pasquale T, Illuminati I, D'Alo S. Depot extracts for rush  
108 venom immunotherapy: A new therapeutic opportunity for Hymenoptera sting allergy.  
109 *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol*. 2018;121(3):376-377.

110

## **A safe and efficient 7-week immunotherapy protocol with aluminum hydroxide adsorbed bee venom**

The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Medical University of Graz (approval no. 27-405 ex 14/15) and all patients gave their written, informed consent.

### **Confirmation of sensitization**

Sensitization was confirmed by IgE determination (ImmunoCAP® system, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA), intradermal tests (0.02mL of 0.01, 0.1 and 1 µg/mL) and prick-tests (10, 100, 300 µg/mL solutions). The basophil activation test (Bühlmann Laboratories, Schönenbuch, Switzerland) helped to distinguish between bee and vespid venom allergy in patients with equivocal history and test results. Tryptase levels were determined using the ImmunoCAP® system.

### **Venom immunotherapy**

During the up-dosing phase, patients were treated with oral non-sedative antihistamines (histamine (H1) receptor blockers) one hour before injection. The purified depot preparation Alutard SQ® bee venom (ALK-Abelló, Hørsholm, Denmark) was administered with an initial dose of 1µg followed by 5, 10, 20, 40, 60, 80 and 100µg corresponding to 1.000, 5.000, 10.000, 20.000, 40.000, 60.000, 80.000, and 100.000 SQ at one-week-intervals by single injections (injection interval: 7 to a maximum of 14 days).

The maintenance phase required single injections every 4-6 weeks with 100µg. All patients were observed for 30 minutes after receiving treatment.