

## EPIDEMIOLOGY AND MECHANISMS

## Comparative epidemiology of suspected perioperative hypersensitivity reactions

Paul Michel Mertes<sup>1,\*,#,†</sup>, Didier G. Ebo<sup>2,#,†</sup>, Tomaz Garcez<sup>3,#,†</sup>, Michael Rose<sup>4,5,#,†</sup>, Vito Sabato<sup>2,#,†</sup>, Tomonori Takazawa<sup>6,#,†</sup>, Peter J. Cooke<sup>7,†</sup>, Russell C. Clarke<sup>8,9,†</sup>, Pascale Dewachter<sup>10,11,†</sup>, Lene H. Garvey<sup>12,13,†</sup>, Anne B. Guttormsen<sup>14,15,†</sup>, David L. Hepner<sup>16,†</sup>, Phil M. Hopkins<sup>17,†</sup>, David A. Khan<sup>18,†</sup>, Helen Kolawole<sup>19,20,†</sup>, Peter Kopac<sup>21,†</sup>, Mogens Krøigaard<sup>12,†</sup>, Jose J. Laguna<sup>22,†</sup>, Stuart D. Marshall<sup>19,20,†</sup>, Peter R. Platt<sup>8,9,†</sup>, Paul H. M. Sadleir<sup>8,9,23,†</sup>, Louise C. Savic<sup>24,†</sup>, Sinisa Savic<sup>25,†</sup>, Gerald W. Volcheck<sup>26,†</sup> and Susanna Voltolini<sup>27,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Anesthesia and Intensive Care, Hôpitaux Universitaires de Strasbourg, Nouvel Hôpital Civil, Strasbourg, France, <sup>2</sup>Department of Immunology, Allergology and Rheumatology, University of Antwerp, Antwerp University Hospital, Antwerp, Belgium, <sup>3</sup>Department of Immunology, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK, <sup>4</sup>Northern Clinical School, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia, <sup>5</sup>Department of Anaesthesia, Royal North Shore Hospital, Sydney, Australia, <sup>6</sup>Intensive Care Unit, Gunma University Hospital, Gunma, Japan, <sup>7</sup>Department of Anaesthesia and Perioperative Medicine, Auckland City Hospital, Auckland, New Zealand, <sup>8</sup>Department of Anaesthesia, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Perth, Western Australia, Australia, <sup>9</sup>Anaesthetic Allergy Referral Centre of Western Australia, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Perth, Australia, <sup>10</sup>Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care, Groupe Hospitalier de Paris-Seine-Saint-Denis, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Paris, France, <sup>11</sup>Université Paris 13, Sorbonne-Paris-Cité, Paris, France, <sup>12</sup>Danish Anaesthesia Allergy Centre, Allergy Clinic, Department of Dermatology and Allergy, Copenhagen University Hospital, Gentofte, Denmark, <sup>13</sup>Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark, <sup>14</sup>Department of Anaesthesia and Intensive Care, Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen, Norway, <sup>15</sup>Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway, <sup>16</sup>Department of Anesthesiology, Perioperative and Pain Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA, <sup>17</sup>Leeds Institute of Medical Research at St James's, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK, <sup>18</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Allergy and Immunology, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX, USA, <sup>19</sup>Department of Anaesthesia and Perioperative Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, <sup>20</sup>Department of Anaesthesia, Peninsula Health, Melbourne, Australia, <sup>21</sup>Division of Allergology, University Clinic of Respiratory and Allergic Diseases, Golnik, Slovenia, <sup>22</sup>Allergy Unit, Allergo-Anaesthesia

Unit, Hospital Central de la Cruz Roja, Faculty of Medicine, Alfonso X El Sabio University, ARADyAL, Madrid, Spain, <sup>23</sup>Department of Pharmacology, University of Western Australia, Crawley, Australia, <sup>24</sup>Anaesthetic Department, Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Leeds, UK, <sup>25</sup>Department of Clinical Immunology and Allergy, Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Leeds, UK, <sup>26</sup>Division of Allergic Diseases, Mayo Clinic College of Medicine, Rochester, MN, USA and <sup>27</sup>Allergy Unit, S. Martino Policlinic Hospital, Genoa, Italy

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: paul-michel.mertes@chru-strasbourg.fr

#These authors contributed equally.

†The authors are members of the ISPAR (International Suspected Perioperative Allergic Reaction) Group.

## Summary

Suspected perioperative hypersensitivity reactions are rare but contribute significantly to the morbidity and mortality of surgical procedures. Recent publications have highlighted the differences between countries concerning the respective risk of different drugs, and changes in patterns of causal agents and the emergence of new allergens. This review summarises recent information on the epidemiology of perioperative hypersensitivity reactions, with specific consideration of differences between geographic areas for the most frequently involved offending agents.

**Keywords:** antibiotics; blood products; chlorhexidine; latex; neuromuscular blocking agents; perioperative anaphylaxis; perioperative hypersensitivity; sugammadex

Perioperative hypersensitivity (POH) reactions are, in most cases, completely unexpected and unpredictable critical events presenting suddenly without warning. Reactions may be either of allergic or non-allergic origin.<sup>1,2</sup> Severity of reactions ranges from mild to severe, and, in extreme cases, may be fatal despite prompt recognition, prolonged adequate resuscitation, and treatment. After pioneering work conducted in Australia,<sup>3</sup> the UK,<sup>4</sup> and France,<sup>5</sup> our knowledge about the epidemiology of perioperative anaphylaxis has substantially improved. Data are now available from large numbers of clinical practice publications, clinical databases, and allergen surveys from many countries.<sup>6–17</sup>

Although surveillance and analysis of rare and random adverse drug reactions represent statistical challenges, we now have clear evidence that differences between countries do exist. Several factors may contribute to these differences, such as gene–environment interactions, but also differences in anaesthesiology practice, variability in clinical recognition of potential POH reactions, and subsequent referral or variability in the comprehensiveness of the allergy evaluation. However, we have learned to take advantage of these differences to increase our knowledge about hypersensitivity reactions,<sup>18</sup> either concerning the respective risk of different drugs or the changing patterns of causal agents and the emergence of new allergens. Recent publications have highlighted these changes in the respective risks for antibiotics,<sup>12,19</sup> neuromuscular blocking agents (NMBAs) and sugammadex,<sup>8,11,12,19,20</sup> natural latex,<sup>19</sup> dyes,<sup>12,19,21</sup> and chlorhexidine.<sup>12,22</sup> This review summarises important recent information on the epidemiology of POH, with specific consideration to geographical differences for the most frequently involved causal agents.

## Methods

A literature search was performed in the US National Center for Biomedical Information PubMed database with MeSH

terms relevant to epidemiologic aspects of POH/anaphylaxis including triggers, geographical differences, and trends. Additional reports of interest identified by the writing group were included. Retrieved results were then reviewed to summarise the current knowledge of POH epidemiology.

## Global incidence and mortality: similarities and regional differences

Several series from different countries have estimated the incidence of POH to be in the range of one in 18 600 to one in 353 anaesthetic procedures with substantial geographical variability.<sup>11,17,19,20,23–31</sup> In the recent 6th National Audit Project (NAP6) of the Royal College of Anaesthetists, the incidence of severe life-threatening anaphylaxis (grades 3 and 4 POH) was estimated at one in 10 000 anaesthetic procedures. Because of methodology limitations the true incidence of severe reactions was estimated to be 70% higher.<sup>12</sup>

Anaphylaxis is often thought to be allergic, that is mediated by drug-specific immunoglobulin E (IgE) antibodies.<sup>32</sup> However, other immune and non-immune mechanisms such as IgG antibodies, non-specific direct histamine release, contact phase or complement activation and off-target occupation of mast cell MRGPRX2 (Mas-related G-protein coupled receptor member X2) receptors may be involved<sup>33,34</sup>; these account for 40% of the cases in some series.<sup>19,20,35</sup> Moreover, POH might even occur independently of mast cell and basophil activation, for example by interference with enzymes such as cyclooxygenase 1 (COX1). The incidence of presumed IgE-mediated reactions during anaesthesia has been estimated to be in the range of one in 5000 to one in 13 000.<sup>3,36</sup> These data should be interpreted cautiously, as a positive skin test does not necessarily reflect a genuine IgE-mediated reaction.<sup>37</sup>

The most powerful incidence estimate was reported in France, where a combined analysis of three different independent databases using a capture–recapture method allowed a nationally based estimation of the incidence of

immediate allergic (IgE-mediated) reactions of all grades occurring during anaesthesia, according to sex, age, and causal substance. This report has confirmed the general view that immediate-type hypersensitivity reactions are largely underreported, the incidence of allergic reactions being estimated at 100.6 (76.2–125.3) per million procedures (one in 10 000), a result that is very similar to that reported in NAP6.<sup>12,38</sup>

POH, including anaphylaxis, occur in a monitored setting, and recent studies have shown that recognition of anaphylaxis was generally prompt.<sup>39,40</sup> If anaesthesiologists were considered reluctant to administer epinephrine (adrenaline) in Denmark,<sup>41</sup> this does not seem to be the case in the UK and France.<sup>39,40</sup> In both countries, most patients with severe reactions were adequately managed with rapid administration of epinephrine; however, fluid administration was sometimes regarded as insufficient. Despite adequate resuscitation, per-case mortality was estimated at one in 26.6 cases in the UK, a result very similar to that observed in France for mortality related to NMBA anaphylaxis.<sup>39,40</sup> Even after well treated anaphylactic reactions, adverse sequelae were seen in one-third of cases.<sup>40</sup>

A very similar perioperative mortality rate of 4–4.76% has been recorded for all causative drugs in the USA and Japan, respectively.<sup>42,43</sup> This contrasts with the low rate of 0–1.4% recently reported for Western Australia (2000–9).<sup>25</sup>

## Causal agents

### *Neuromuscular blocking agents and sugammadex*

In many countries, NMBAs are by far the most frequently incriminated culprit, and represent the first<sup>3,8,16,19,20,44,45</sup> or the second<sup>12,13</sup> most common cause of POH. Significant differences are observed concerning the frequency of alleged IgE-mediated reactions to NMBAs between countries. Reactions have been reported with a high frequency in France,<sup>19,20,38,46–48</sup> Australia and New Zealand,<sup>8</sup> the UK,<sup>12</sup> Norway,<sup>7</sup> Belgium,<sup>44,45</sup> South Korea,<sup>49</sup> and Spain.<sup>13,27</sup> The incidence of IgE-mediated reactions has been estimated at 184.0 per million (95% confidence interval, 139.3–229.7) anaesthetics, reaching 250.9 per million (189.8–312.9) for women in France.<sup>38</sup> POH reactions to NMBAs seem to be less frequent in Sweden,<sup>18</sup> Denmark,<sup>6</sup> and the USA.<sup>50–52</sup> Although the incidence seems to remain relatively stable in France,<sup>35</sup> a significant decrease has been observed in Norway since the withdrawal of the antitussive pholcodine, which may play a role in NMBA sensitisation.<sup>53,54</sup>

Structure–activity studies have established that the IgE recognition site of NMBAs involves the tertiary and quaternary substituted ammonium groups and their molecular environment.<sup>55,56</sup> This could explain the frequent but not constant skin cross-sensitivity between different NMBAs observed in patients allergic to NMBAs, and variability between patients.<sup>57</sup> An alternative explanation for cross-sensitivity in drug naïve patients could relate to off-target occupancy of the MRGPRX2 receptor by various NMBAs.<sup>34,37</sup> Cross-sensitivity to all NMBAs is unusual; only ~7% of patients in the last French study.<sup>19</sup> Patients suffering from anaphylaxis to succinylcholine cross-react with cis-atracurium in 10% of cases and with rocuronium in 20% of cases. Cross-sensitivity is most frequently observed with rocuronium and less frequently with cis-atracurium.<sup>8,19,44,58</sup> Cross-sensitivity between cis-atracurium and atracurium is frequent but not constant, observed in ~50% of patients suffering from anaphylaxis to one of these two drugs.<sup>19,58</sup> These cross-sensitivity results strongly support the absolute necessity of a systematic cross-sensitivity

investigation in patients who survive anaphylaxis to an NMBA in order to identify a possible safe drug for the future.<sup>33,59,60</sup>

Differences have been reported regarding the relative risk of allergic reactions with the various NMBAs available.<sup>61</sup> Several studies report succinylcholine and rocuronium to be associated with a higher risk of anaphylaxis, whereas pancuronium and cis-atracurium are reported to be the NMBAs associated with the lowest incidence of anaphylaxis.<sup>8,10,38,44,46,47,49,62</sup> This was not found in the NAP6 survey where only succinylcholine was considered at higher risk, with similar risk shared by the other NMBAs. However, in the UK, the market share of cis-atracurium was only 1.6%, and 40.6% for rocuronium.<sup>12</sup> Thus, comparison of the respective allergic risk of rocuronium and cis-atracurium in this report cannot be accurately assessed.

Sensitisation may occur during previous anaesthesia but the majority of patients are drug naïve, that is they do not report previous exposure.<sup>44,56</sup> This suggests that there must be alternative, probably environmental, factors that play a role in cross-sensitising patients to NMBAs. Sensitisation resulting from exposure to compounds containing tertiary substituted ammonium group, quaternary substituted ammonium group, or both, such as cosmetics or disinfectants, has been hypothesised.<sup>56</sup> This hypothesis is supported by a recent study conducted on hairdressers demonstrating a significant increase in IgE sensitisation to NMBAs and quaternary ammonium ion compounds,<sup>63</sup> although the clinical significance of this increase remains to be demonstrated. An attractive alternative hypothesis arises from the work published by Florvaag and colleagues,<sup>64</sup> who provided repeated evidence for a connection between the consumption of pholcodine, an opioid antitussive, and IgE-mediated anaphylactic reactions to NMBAs.<sup>64–67</sup> Nevertheless, patients with a genuine pholcodine allergy can have congruent negative skin tests and basophil activation tests to NMBAs, suggesting that allergy to this opioid does not necessarily preclude use of NMBAs.<sup>45</sup> Johansson and colleagues<sup>68</sup> showed, retrospectively, that pholcodine withdrawal from the Swedish market was associated with a decrease in the prevalence of sensitisation against ammonium groups in the general population. Their observations have led to the withdrawal of pholcodine from the Norwegian market. This resulted in a progressive decrease in IgE antibodies to quaternary substituted ammonium in the population and in the number of reports of allergic reactions to NMBAs.<sup>53,54</sup> A prospective 4 yr case–control study (the ALPHO study: ALlergie aux curares et exposition à la PHolcodine) designed to confirm this possible link between pholcodine exposure and sensitisation to NMBAs in France was initiated in 2015.

The NMBA reversal drug sugammadex was launched in the USA (December 2015) much later than in Europe (2008) or Japan (2010) because of US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) concerns about hypersensitivity reactions. As the use of sugammadex in Europe is limited (probably because of its high cost), occurrence of immediate sugammadex-induced anaphylaxis seems rare.<sup>12</sup> In contrast, the incidence of sugammadex-induced anaphylaxis was recently reported as about one in 2500 administrations (0.039%) based on a retrospective observational study conducted in a single Japanese hospital.<sup>69</sup> Sugammadex usage in Japan in 2010, in terms of monetary value, was more than four times higher than that in Spain, the country with the second-highest usage.<sup>11</sup> The popularity of sugammadex in Japan is such that it has been administered to approximately 10% of the total Japanese population during the 8 yr period since its release.<sup>70</sup> This

suggests that the difference in sugammadex-induced anaphylaxis between countries can be explained, at least in part, by differences in the total amount of sugammadex used. The authors of the Japanese study referred to a previous observational study reported from New Zealand that showed that the estimated incidence of anaphylaxis caused by succinylcholine and rocuronium was 0.048% and 0.04%, respectively,<sup>10</sup> and concluded that the incidence of sugammadex-induced anaphylaxis is roughly equivalent to that induced by succinylcholine or rocuronium.<sup>69</sup> Based on this speculation, one can estimate that the total incidence of intraoperative anaphylactic events will increase by at least one-third with the full-scale introduction of sugammadex.<sup>71</sup>

Two recent reports conducted in healthy non-anaesthetised subjects receiving sugammadex at doses of either 4 or 16 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>, or placebo, repeated twice at weekly intervals, showed an unexpected and dose-related high rate of immediate hypersensitivity reactions after sugammadex administration. The incidence of confirmed hypersensitivity was determined to be 0.7% in the 4 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> group, 4.7% in the 16 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> group, and 0% in the placebo group in one study.<sup>72</sup> In the second study, the incidence of hypersensitivity was 6.6% in the 4 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> group, 9.5% in the 16 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> group, and 1.3% of the placebo group.<sup>73</sup> These high rates of reactions contrasts with the number of reactions reported in clinical practice, and highlights the need for a careful survey of sugammadex-related hypersensitivity reactions. Based on current knowledge, sugammadex cannot be recommended as appropriate in the treatment of suspected rocuronium allergy.<sup>74</sup>

Although the mechanism of sugammadex-induced anaphylaxis remains elusive, various hypotheses have been proposed. As sugammadex is a modified  $\gamma$ -cyclodextrin, which is also used for food additives, exposure to  $\gamma$ -cyclodextrin may be the sensitising trigger.<sup>75</sup> Cyclodextrin is frequently used in foods and cosmetics because it can change the physical properties of various compounds by their encapsulation within the cyclic structure. The average person is thought to ingest about 4 g of  $\gamma$ -cyclodextrin per day from food.<sup>76</sup> Therefore, even people who have never received sugammadex may be sensitised by food and cosmetics. None of 12 patients who suffered anaphylaxis to sugammadex had a history of previous sugammadex exposure.<sup>77</sup> If this hypothesis is correct, the incidence of sugammadex-induced anaphylaxis may vary from country to country because the use of food containing cyclodextrins in each country is likely to differ. Another hypothesis is that sugammadex causes anaphylaxis only after it complexes with rocuronium, based on several clinical cases<sup>78–82</sup> in which rocuronium and sugammadex alone had negative results by skin test, but were positive when combined. These cases suggest that sugammadex may change its structure and become an antigenic determinant after forming a complex with rocuronium.

### Hypnotics

Historically hypnotic agents were responsible for a significant proportion of cases of perioperative anaphylaxis, but discontinuation of agents using Cremophor EL as a solvent and declining use of thiopental has dramatically changed this. In the most recent GERAP (Groupe d'Etude des Reactions Anaphylactiques Perioperatoires) survey of anaphylaxis in France, hypnotics were responsible for 2.2% of cases, with propofol and ketamine being responsible for five reactions each and midazolam a single reaction.<sup>19</sup> The recent NAP6 survey in the UK identified only a single case of hypnotic anaphylaxis.<sup>12</sup> This

reaction was to propofol, and the authors highlighted the relative safety of propofol given that approximately 2 million patients are administered propofol annually in the UK.<sup>12</sup>

There has been ongoing debate about whether it is safe to administer propofol in cases of egg, soy, and peanut allergy. Studies in Denmark and Spain in recent years suggest that it is.<sup>83,84</sup> There has been a case report of anaphylaxis to propofol in a patient without clinical history of soy allergy but latent sensitisation demonstrable by positive specific IgE (sIgE).<sup>85</sup> A single report of a child with egg allergy who experienced urticaria and erythema after propofol and had a borderline positive skin test<sup>86</sup> led Harper<sup>87</sup> to suggest that propofol is safe for use in adults with peanut, soy, or egg allergy.

### Opioids

Opioids include (1) naturally occurring opiate alkaloids derived from opium (the liquid released by scratched immature seed pods of the opium poppy, *Papaver somniferum*) such as morphine and codeine; (2) semisynthetic opioids such as pholcodine, hydrocodone, hydromorphone, and diamorphine; and (3) synthetic compounds that are chemically not related to opiates such as methadone, pethidine, fentanyl, and tramadol. Many natural and (semi)synthetic opioids are potent non-specific liberators of histamine. Non-allergic histaminic reactions are much more prevalent than IgE-mediated hypersensitivity to these drugs and they probably result from off-target occupation of the MRGPRX2 receptor,<sup>88,89</sup> rather than from binding to the opioid  $\mu$ -receptor.<sup>90</sup> Data suggest that many patients labelled with opioid/opiate allergy do not have a genuine IgE-mediated allergy.<sup>91,92</sup> The reason for this mislabelling is often the uncertainties associated with the use of skin tests<sup>93</sup> with these potent non-specific histamine releasers and unavailability of validated or reliable sIgE assays.<sup>94</sup> Indeed, allergic reactions to these substances are exceedingly rarely reported despite their ubiquitous use during anaesthesia.<sup>6,7,12,13,44,95,96</sup>

### Local anaesthetics

Local anaesthetics are commonly used in the perioperative environment, yet no cases of proven local anaesthetic allergy were reported in the NAP6 survey<sup>12</sup> or two other recent studies of perioperative anaphylaxis.<sup>19,97</sup> True hypersensitivity reactions to local anaesthetic drugs are considered rare.<sup>98–100</sup> Many reports of allergy prove to be spurious, often related to side-effects of injections in awake patients (e.g. vasovagal reactions) or adverse effects of rapid absorption of vasopressor or toxic serum levels of local anaesthetic. Excipients in local anaesthetic preparations may also be responsible for suspected local anaesthetic hypersensitivity reactions, such as chlorhexidine in urethral gels. Delayed hypersensitivity can also occur with local anaesthetics.

The ester group of local anaesthetics (e.g. procaine, tetracaine) is considered to be more antigenic than the amide group (e.g. lidocaine, bupivacaine, ropivacaine). The *para*-amino-benzoic acid metabolite of esters is thought to be responsible for much of the antigenicity of this group.<sup>33,101</sup> Assessment of suspected immediate hypersensitivity to local anaesthetics should involve skin tests and subcutaneous challenge tests.<sup>97,99</sup>

### Antibiotics

Antibiotics, mainly  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics such as amoxicillin/clavulanic acid, cefazolin, and cefuroxime, constitute another

significant cause of perioperative anaphylaxis.<sup>6,7,12,13,19,20,38,44,45,50,52,95,96,102,103</sup> In most patients, diagnosis of  $\beta$ -lactam allergy is readily established by skin tests, which still merit a place as the primary diagnostic tool.<sup>104–106</sup> However, for some compounds there appears to be room for considerable improvement, mainly in optimising the concentration of drug to be used for skin tests.<sup>107</sup> The potential and limitations of *in vitro* tests in the diagnostic management of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics have been reviewed recently.<sup>108</sup>

The NAP6 allergen exposure survey<sup>109</sup> showed that choice of antibiotic prophylaxis was influenced by preoperative penicillin allergy history in 25% of the patients who received teicoplanin or vancomycin, and thereby probably contributed to the high incidence of teicoplanin-induced anaphylaxis in the UK.<sup>12</sup> Other frequently applied alternatives are vancomycin and clindamycin. With the knowledge that history of penicillin allergy is wrong in more than 90% of cases, effective de-labelling is mandatory to optimise appropriate antibiotic administration.<sup>110,111</sup> Obsolete historic data and statistics suggesting extensive cross-reactivity between penicillins and first-generation cephalosporins such as cephalothin and cephaloridine continue to influence modern practice. Therefore, many patients with unverified  $\beta$ -lactam allergy are labelled as ‘pan- $\beta$ -lactam’ allergic, leading to the withholding of penicillins, cephalosporins, and monobactams. However, during the past few decades, evidence has accumulated that this ‘pan- $\beta$ -lactam’ allergy label is false in most cases. For example, cefazolin allergy is generally selective,<sup>107</sup> and rarely associated with cross-reactivity to penicillins or other cephalosporins. It appears that cefazolin is generally safe in patients with an IgE-mediated or non-IgE-mediated penicillin allergy, especially when the history is vague.<sup>112–114</sup> Cefazolin does not share an R1 and R2 group with any other  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotic.<sup>115</sup> There are limited data on cefazolin safety in patients with a history of a significant reaction to penicillin or positive skin testing to penicillin. There is no evidence that the administration of a ‘test dose’ of an antibiotic reduces the severity of an ensuing reaction,<sup>12</sup> and current guidelines are advising against this practice.<sup>116</sup> In contrast, there are different arguments for antibiotics to be systematically administered before induction of anaesthesia.<sup>12</sup> This is likely to improve the detection of unknown allergies, simplify treatment, and orientate the diagnostic investigation.

### *Hevea latex*

Since the discovery of the vulcanisation process by Goodyear and Hayward in the mid-19th century, natural rubber latex (NRL) from *Hevea brasiliensis* has been used in medical devices for its elastic properties. The first cases of allergy to NRL were reported in 1927 by Stern<sup>117</sup> and Grimm.<sup>118</sup> In 1984, Turjanmaa and colleagues<sup>119</sup> reported the first cases of perioperative anaphylaxis attributed to NRL in healthcare workers (nurses) who underwent surgery. In 1989, Slater<sup>120</sup> reported the case of NRL allergy in two children with spina bifida. In 1990, Moneret-Vautrin and colleagues<sup>121</sup> confirmed an increased risk in patients with a spina bifida associated with the detection of specific IgE against NRL and recommended an NRL-free environment for these patients during surgery.

The number of reported cases of allergy to NRL rapidly increased in the 1980s and reached its peak during the 1990s. The prevailing hypothesis to explain this rapid increase in NRL sensitisation is that the implementation of high hygiene standards after the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)

epidemic led to an increased demand for NRL gloves. To respond to this demand, producers had to change their manufacturing process by reducing the leaching steps of NRL, leading to the release of higher protein content products. High protein content increased antigen exposure and extractable proteins leading to NRL sensitisation.<sup>122</sup> Moreover, donning glove powder absorbs most NRL proteins and facilitates their airborne dissemination increasing the risk of sensitisation for healthcare workers and patients.<sup>123</sup>

Several populations at risk have been identified including children with spina bifida,<sup>124,125</sup> those with a history of multiple surgeries, especially during childhood,<sup>126</sup> healthcare workers,<sup>127</sup> and non-healthcare workers frequently exposed to NRL.<sup>128</sup> Atopy has been associated with a higher risk of NRL allergy in the general population and among healthcare workers.<sup>129</sup> However, a recent population-based study showed no significant association between atopy and NRL allergy when exposure is low.<sup>130</sup> Some allergies to fruits and vegetable have been associated with a higher risk of NRL allergy, but this may reflect cross-sensitisation that is not always clinically relevant. Chestnut, avocado, banana, and kiwi are the most frequently associated with NRL allergy, a condition referred as the latex-fruit syndrome.<sup>131,132</sup>

Two Italian studies reported an increased risk of NRL sensitisation in pregnant women when compared with women having gynaecological surgery,<sup>133,134</sup> results that need to be confirmed.

The incidence of NRL-related perioperative IgE-mediated reactions was estimated at 59.1 reactions (44.8–73.6) per 1 million anaesthetics in France between 1997 and 2004 with an increased incidence in women (91.0 [68.9–113.4]).<sup>38</sup> More recent studies in many countries show a marked decrease in NRL anaphylaxis when compared with other causes of IgE-mediated POH. In a large multicentre study of more than 31 000 paediatric anaesthetic procedures performed in Europe between 2014 and 2015, only one complication was attributed to NRL allergy.<sup>135</sup>

This reduction of NRL sensitisation observed in the general population<sup>136</sup> can be attributed to efforts made by manufacturers and healthcare providers during the past 10 yr to reduce NRL exposure. Primary prevention is based on increased awareness of the risk of NRL allergy, NRL avoidance in at-risk populations, particularly children, use of powder-free latex gloves, and recognition of clinical signs. Interestingly, in Thailand, where the sensitisation to NRL was previously low, the continued use of powdered gloves led to increased sensitisation to NRL in healthcare workers.<sup>137</sup>

### *Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs*

NSAIDs are COX inhibitors commonly used in perioperative settings during general anaesthesia and after operation for analgesia. They are a rare but well recognised cause of POH.<sup>19,138</sup> Hypersensitivity to multiple NSAIDs with dissimilar structures is mediated by inhibition of the COX-1 isoenzyme.<sup>32</sup> It is most likely to feature exacerbations of respiratory disease in susceptible patients, urticaria, or angioedema.<sup>139,140</sup> Less commonly, true anaphylaxis occurs to NSAIDs and is the result of an IgE-mediated allergic reaction to a particular NSAID. In this situation, cross-reactivity may occur to NSAIDs that belong to the same chemical subgroup of NSAIDs, but the majority of NSAIDs will be non-reactive.

Paracetamol is another rare cause of anaphylaxis,<sup>140</sup> particularly in the perioperative setting. The intravenous

preparation may contain mannitol that has been responsible for one such reaction that goes undetected by oral drug challenge.<sup>141</sup> Hypersensitivity resulting from COX-1 isoenzyme inhibition is also possible at high doses.<sup>142</sup>

### Disinfectants

Chlorhexidine is known as a major cause of POH. Since the first case of proven chlorhexidine-induced anaphylaxis reported in 1989,<sup>143</sup> numerous further cases have been reported mostly related to anaesthesia and surgery. Chlorhexidine products are recommended increasingly to reduce infection risks for patients. For example, national UK guidelines recommend use of 2% chlorhexidine in 70% isopropyl alcohol as the skin disinfectant of choice for central venous catheter insertion and for urethral catheterisation. The use of a chlorhexidine-containing urethral lubricant for catheterisation is also suggested.<sup>144</sup> According to the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency licensing records, the percentage of products containing chlorhexidine has significantly increased over the past 20 yr.<sup>145</sup> Moreover, even in non-medical environments, chlorhexidine is found in many commercially available products, including mouthwashes, antiseptic creams, toothpaste, and plasters. This increase in chlorhexidine containing products in both medical and non-medical environments clearly identifies its popularity, which may explain the increasing susceptibility to sensitisation followed by the high incidence of chlorhexidine-induced anaphylaxis.

Although chlorhexidine represented 9% of culprit drugs for POH in the NAP6 study,<sup>12</sup> regional differences are large in the incidence of chlorhexidine-induced anaphylaxis. Chlorhexidine is frequently incriminated in the UK,<sup>146</sup> Belgium,<sup>45</sup> Australia,<sup>147</sup> and Denmark,<sup>6,22</sup> which are countries where chlorhexidine is routinely tested in all patients investigated for suspected perioperative allergy. Reactions are relatively rare in France, probably because of a limited use of chlorhexidine as a disinfectant in the operating room.<sup>20</sup> The causative chlorhexidine product was reportedly chlorhexidine-containing lubricant for urinary catheter (44%), chlorhexidine-impregnated central venous catheters (35%), and topical chlorhexidine (16%) in a recent review.<sup>147</sup> Chlorhexidine-induced anaphylaxis predominantly occurs in males (~80%).<sup>145,147</sup> This may be because of the more frequent use of urethral lubricant in males. The first case of chlorhexidine-impregnated catheter anaphylaxis was reported in 1997,<sup>148</sup> and acute anaphylactic shock during anaesthesia has been reported in Japanese and European patients after insertion of chlorhexidine-impregnated catheters. Such adverse events prompted government warnings in Japan,<sup>143</sup> the USA,<sup>149</sup> and Australia.<sup>150</sup> These led to Japan withdrawing all chlorhexidine-impregnated central venous catheters.<sup>151</sup> Although it is not common, POH caused by topical chlorhexidine has also been reported.<sup>143,152,153</sup> A high rate of reactions to topical chlorhexidine was reported in Japan, and as a result specific recommendations regarding the maximum chlorhexidine concentration to be used were issued.<sup>143</sup> Additional warnings concerning urethral gels have been issued. In contrast, the guideline published by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommends skin preparation with a >0.5% chlorhexidine solution with alcohol before central venous catheter and peripheral arterial catheter insertion<sup>154</sup>, even more concentrated (2%) chlorhexidine is recommended for the same purpose in the UK.<sup>155</sup> Although

the incidence of anaphylaxis caused by topical chlorhexidine in the USA is unknown, one can expect a high incidence there as well. Collaborative international studies to compare the usage of chlorhexidine in each country with the incidence of anaphylaxis caused by chlorhexidine would be beneficial. Taken together, the incidence of anaphylaxis caused by chlorhexidine is likely to be underestimated, and clinicians should be aware that chlorhexidine is one of the 'hidden' causes of POH.<sup>138</sup> The problem of chlorhexidine allergy in the perioperative setting is discussed in greater depth by Rose and colleagues.<sup>156</sup>

A few cases of anaphylaxis caused by povidone-iodine have been also reported,<sup>157,158</sup> although it is notably less than that caused by chlorhexidine.

### Dyes

Blue dyes have long been associated with anaphylaxis in the perioperative period, first described in the 1960s.<sup>159,160</sup> They are frequently used by surgeons in combination with radioactive isotope to facilitate mapping of lymphatic drainage and identification of sentinel lymph nodes (SLNs) in cases of breast cancer and melanoma. Anaphylaxis to dyes is often delayed in onset compared with i.v. perioperative antigens,<sup>12,21</sup> probably as a result of slow absorption from subcutaneous tissue and lymphatics,<sup>21,161</sup> delay of recognition, or both because of interference with pulse oximetry with (prolonged) artificial lowering of readings.<sup>21,162</sup> The two most commonly used blue dyes for SLN identification are patent blue V (also known as E-131, commonly used in Europe and Australia) and isosulfan blue (commonly used in the USA). The close structural relationship between these two vital dyes (isosulfan blue is a structural isomer of patent blue which is often confused with its hydroxylated relative, patent blue V) means that cross-reactivity has been described and should be assumed.<sup>163</sup> In contrast, methylene blue is structurally dissimilar and would not be expected to cross-react, although this has been described.<sup>21,164</sup> Allergy to dyes is mainly documented by skin testing, but basophil activation testing can help to identify safe alternatives.<sup>165</sup>

Controversy about the incidence of reactions to these dyes has existed for years. Barthelmes and colleagues<sup>166</sup> looked at several studies of isosulfan blue allergy and reported an allergy rate of 1.42% with severe reactions requiring vasopressor support in 0.44%. In contrast, their own large study of patent blue V reported a lower allergy rate of 0.86% with 0.06% severe using the same criteria. The largest series involving skin test-proven hypersensitivity to patent blue V recorded a rate of 0.34%.<sup>161</sup> In the last survey published in France, blue dyes were the third largest cause of POH of all severity grades.<sup>19</sup> Similarly, the recent NAP6 survey in the UK found that patent blue V was the fourth most prevalent cause of perioperative allergy after antibiotics, NMBAs, and chlorhexidine,<sup>12</sup> and was calculated to occur in one out of 6863 exposures. This value is lower than those in previously mentioned studies, but in perspective is a higher incidence than that calculated for antibiotics, NMBAs, and chlorhexidine once exposure rates are considered. Some centres have begun screening patients using skin tests for detection of hypersensitivity to blue dyes before exposure<sup>167</sup> or advocating consenting patients specifically about risks of hypersensitivity with their use.<sup>166–168</sup>

Methylene blue has been considered a lower allergy risk than patent blue V or isosulfan blue but is theoretically less useful in SLN localisation because of the lack of a sulphonic acid group that would allow lymphatic uptake. Methylene blue

is also less suitable for subcutaneous injection because of the risk of skin and fat necrosis. Recent evidence suggests that it may be equally suitable at detecting SLN as patent blue V.<sup>169</sup> Isolated case reports of hypersensitivity to methylene blue exist.<sup>170–172</sup>

### Colloids

The epidemiology of hypersensitivity reactions to colloids has changed because of the withdrawal of some colloids from the market and restrictions in the use of others. Only a few studies are relevant to the epidemiology of currently used colloids.

Synthetic colloids are associated with the higher risk of hypersensitivity reactions.<sup>173</sup> In a study in which human albumin was used as a reference, the estimated risk of hypersensitivity reaction to gelatin was 12 times higher, hydroxyethyl starch four times higher, and dextrans two times higher per administration.<sup>174</sup> However, hydroxyethyl starch 130/0.4 was not evaluated in this study and old modified fluid gelatins (Haemaccel®, Piramal Healthcare, Mortpeth, Northumberland, UK), with histamine-releasing properties,<sup>175</sup> are no longer used in Western countries.

Allergic reactions to dextrans are mainly IgG-mediated<sup>173</sup> and can be prevented in most cases by hapten inhibition.<sup>176</sup> As this product is no longer used for vascular filling, these reactions are no longer seen in the perioperative setting.

Hypersensitivity reactions to newer modified fluid gelatins account for 0.6% of POH in the last GERAP study in France and for 1.2% in Norway.<sup>7,19</sup> In the UK, 2.8% of anaesthetists reported seeing a POH caused by colloids.<sup>177</sup> In the NAP6 study, only three cases of gelatin-induced reaction were reported.<sup>12</sup>

In the USA, the use of hydroxyethyl starch was associated with a risk of hypersensitivity reactions with an odds ratio of 1.29 (1.02–1.62).<sup>17</sup> Because of the recent restrictions applied to the use of hydroxyethyl starch, hypersensitivity reactions to this fluid were not described in the last GERAP study in France nor in the NAP6 survey in the UK.<sup>12,19</sup>

### Blood products

Hypersensitivity reactions occur to a heterogeneous group of blood components that vary in their risk of causing serious hypersensitivity reactions. The genesis of true hypersensitivity reactions to blood products is complex and is best divided into recipient- and donor-related aetiologies. In the first of these, a recipient's antibody reacts with an antigen in the blood product. The best known of these is anti-A in a patient who is IgA deficient although many antibodies have been described. For example, traces of drug in the unit can react with the patient's antibodies, which is the reason for measurement of recipient IgA levels in the investigation of possible blood transfusion anaphylaxis.<sup>178</sup> Donor-related reactions include the transfer of antibodies or lymphocytes in the blood product that react to antigens present in the patient.<sup>179</sup>

The NAP6 survey identified two cases of anaphylaxis (one to cryoprecipitate and one to fresh frozen plasma) in an estimated 84 000 perioperative blood product administrations.<sup>12</sup> This may reflect a local haemovigilance scheme but equally may reflect the difficulty in diagnosing perioperative blood product reactions in the absence of a confirmatory skin test and with multiple other suspect antigens. Furthermore, shock during the administration of blood products may result from non-anaphylactic causes such as ABO incompatibility (acute haemolytic transfusion reaction), bacterial

contamination of blood products, bradykinin accumulation,<sup>180</sup> and hypovolaemia.

The incidence of hypersensitivity reactions to blood products overall is estimated as 0.6 per 1000 transfusions.<sup>179</sup> The risk of individual components of blood varies substantially with estimates that platelets cause 1.1 allergic reactions (of all severities) per 1000 transfusions compared with 0.68 and 0.04 for plasma transfusions and red cell concentrates, respectively. Allergic reactions to platelets were likely to be more severe than with other blood components.<sup>181</sup> A report from France suggested that methylene blue treated fresh frozen plasma (introduced as a pathogen reduction strategy) could carry a higher risk of allergic reactions than non-treated units,<sup>171</sup> but this increased risk has not been confirmed in other studies.<sup>182</sup>

### Others

Aprotinin, a polypeptide isolated from bovine lung, is capable of stimulating a specific IgE antibody in humans, and has been shown to cause anaphylaxis. Although the incidence seems to be low,<sup>12</sup> sporadic cases of anaphylaxis caused by aprotinin contained in fibrin glue<sup>183,184</sup> and aprotinin used as an anti-coagulant during cardiac surgery<sup>185,186</sup> have been reported. The risk of hypersensitivity reaction is low after primary exposure to aprotinin. However, application of aprotinin carries a high risk 4–30 days after previous exposure and cannot be recommended for the first 6 months.<sup>185</sup>

Protamine sulphate is a polypeptide that is used to reverse heparin anticoagulation and retard absorption of insulin, often as neutral protamine Hagedorn (NPH). The polypeptide is extracted from salmon milt. In addition to IgE-mediated anaphylaxis, protamine can produce multiple adverse reactions, including non-immune mast cell degranulation, complement activation, or IgG-mediated responses that account for the systemic effects.<sup>187</sup> If anaphylaxis occurs during protamine administration when cardiopulmonary bypass is readily available, the method of managing anticoagulation and potential reversal after reheparinisation is an unsolved issue.<sup>188</sup> Fortunately, the incidence of protamine-induced anaphylaxis appears to be low in most countries.<sup>12,20</sup> Patients who receive protamine-containing insulins are at the greatest risk with an incident rate of adverse effects of 0.6–2% (10–30 times more than other patients) in NPH insulin-dependent diabetics undergoing cardiac surgery.<sup>189,190</sup>

## Discussion

The overall incidence of POH ranges from one in 18 600 to one in 353 with substantial geographical variability (Box 1). Several factors explain these differences including the definition of hypersensitivity or anaphylaxis used and the mechanism and severity of the reactions included. The recent NAP6 survey conducted in the UK included only severe grade 3–5 cases, and the incidence was estimated to be at least one in 10 000 anaesthetics, but was likely underestimated.<sup>12</sup> This incidence is similar to that of IgE-mediated POH of all grades in France, which was based on a combined analysis of two independent databases representing a cohort of 2516 cases.<sup>38</sup>

There is also substantial geographical variability regarding the different drugs or substances involved. There are a large number of variables that can have an impact on the most common causes of perioperative anaphylaxis from country to country. These variables include the ability to identify possible

**Box 1**

## Key points.

- Perioperative hypersensitivity (POH) reactions may be allergic or non-allergic.
- The incidence of POH of all severity grades varies between countries and ranges from one in 18 600 to one in 353 procedures.
- The proportion of presumed POH being immunoglobulin E-mediated allergic reactions seems to be relatively similar between countries (50–60%).
- Mortality ranges from 1.4% to 4.8% depending on series and countries.
- Substantial geographical variability regarding the causative drugs or substances involved is reported.
- Reactions involving neuromuscular blocking agents are the first or second cause in several countries.
- Reactions involving antibiotics are increasing and represent the most frequently incriminated drugs in several countries.
- Reactions involving dyes or chlorhexidine are reported with high and increasing frequency, whereas reactions to natural rubber latex are rapidly decreasing in most series.
- Regional differences and progressive changes in the substances incriminated are a strong incentive for repeated epidemiological surveys in different countries.
- Building a worldwide network dedicated to the investigation of POH will enable a higher standard of patient care and provide valuable data on geographical differences and new or emerging allergen sources

POH and initiate referral, the severity of the reactions that are included, the type of NMBA and antibiotics used by region, the comprehensiveness of the evaluation (i.e. inclusion of all potential allergens the patient was exposed to, such as chlorhexidine, sealants), possible sensitising substances in a region and availability of *in vitro* testing.<sup>35</sup>

Hypersensitivity reactions to NMBAs remain a major cause in most, but not all, countries. Reactions to NRL have been decreasing over the past 20 yr. Reactions involving antibiotics are rapidly increasing, now being more common than NRL and the most common culprit in some series.<sup>12,19</sup>

This increase in antibiotic anaphylaxis may reflect increasing antibiotic sensitisation in the population, but may also be influenced by the type of antibiotics used for prophylaxis. Thus, reactions to teicoplanin appear to be frequent in the UK but not in France.<sup>12</sup> Reactions to cephalosporins represent half of the reactions in France.<sup>19</sup> The use of teicoplanin for prophylaxis is not recommended in France, whereas it is frequently used as an alternative in cases of suspected penicillin allergy in the UK.

Reactions involving chlorhexidine are now being reported with increased frequency.<sup>12,22</sup> It may be difficult to correctly diagnose because of a lack of exposure recognition as exposure to chlorhexidine is rarely documented on anaesthetic charts.<sup>138</sup> Therefore, systematic testing for a possible chlorhexidine allergic reaction seems prudent in cases of POH, even in countries where usage appears to be low.

Allergic reactions involving dyes are also being reported with a high frequency, representing the third most commonly responsible allergen in France. Clinical diagnosis may be difficult as these reactions are usually delayed after dye injection.<sup>21</sup> Reactions to hypnotics, local anaesthetics, and NSAIDs remain uncommon in the perioperative environment.

**Conclusions**

Owing to the rare occurrence of POH, it is mandatory that collaborations are established both within and across specialties to form centres that can build up and report expertise in this highly specialised field. Building a worldwide network dedicated to the investigation of these reactions will not only enable a higher standard of patient care, but will also lead to research collaborations and provide invaluable data on geographical differences, changes in patterns of causal agents, and new or emerging allergen sources.

**Authors' contributions**

Design of the study: PMM, DE, TG, MR, VS, TT.

Drafting of manuscript: PMM, DE, TG, MR, VS, TT.

Study conception; data collection, analysis, and interpretation; revising paper: all authors.

**Declarations of interest**

PD receives lecture and travel fees from MSD France (Courbevoie, France) and from Bracco Imaging France (Courcouronnes, France), support from Agence Nationale de Sécurité du Médicament et des Produits de Santé (Saint-Denis, France), expert for a task force on 'neuromuscular blocking agents and anaphylactic reactions' (until 2016), and is a MSD Expert Board on 'neuromuscular blocking agents and fast-tracking anaesthesia' (until October 2019); LHG is a consultant and adjudication committee member for Merck, NJ, USA and for Novo Nordisk Denmark; PMH is an Editorial Board Member of the *British Journal of Anaesthesia*; PMM is a scientific advisor for the ALPHO study (NCT02250729) funded by a consortium of pharmaceutical companies: Zambon, Urgo, Pierre Fabre, Boots, Hepatoum, Biocodex, Sanofi, LBR, GSK, APL, Bells Healthcare, Pinewood, T & R, Ernest Jackson; PK receives lecture fees from Novartis Pharma Services Inc. and Shire Pharmaceuticals Group Plc.; SM has a Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) ECR Fellowship for investigation of cognitive aids in emergencies. All other authors confirm that they have no interests to declare.

**References**

1. Sabato V, Platt P, Garcez T, Cooke P. Suspected perioperative allergic reactions: nomenclature and terminology. *Br J Anaesth* 2019; **123**: e13–5
2. Johansson SG, Hourihane JO, Bousquet J, et al. A revised nomenclature for allergy. An EAACI position statement from the EAACI nomenclature task force. *Allergy* 2001; **56**: 813–24
3. Fisher MM, More DG. The epidemiology and clinical features of anaphylactic reactions in anaesthesia. *Anaesth Intensive Care* 1981; **9**: 226–34
4. Watkins J, Clarke RS. Report of a symposium: adverse responses to intravenous agents. *Br J Anaesth* 1978; **50**: 1159–64



5. Vignon H, Gay R, Laxenaire MC. Clinical observations of per- and post-anesthetic anaphylactoid complications. Results of an a posteriori survey. *Ann Anesthesiol Fr* 1976; **17**: 117–21
6. Garvey LH, Roed-Petersen J, Menne T, Husum B. Danish anaesthesia allergy centre — preliminary results. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2001; **45**: 1204–9
7. Harboe T, Guttormsen AB, Irgens A, Dybendal T, Florvaag E. Anaphylaxis during anesthesia in Norway: a 6-year single-center follow-up study. *Anesthesiology* 2005; **102**: 897–903
8. Sadleir PH, Clarke RC, Bunning DL, Platt PR. Anaphylaxis to neuromuscular blocking drugs: incidence and cross-reactivity in Western Australia from 2002 to 2011. *Br J Anaesth* 2013; **110**: 981–7
9. Fisher MM, Jones K, Rose M. Follow-up after anaesthetic anaphylaxis. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2011; **55**: 99–103
10. Reddy JI, Cooke PJ, van Schalkwyk JM, Hannam JA, Fitzharris P, Mitchell SJ. Anaphylaxis is more common with rocuronium and succinylcholine than with atracurium. *Anesthesiology* 2015; **122**: 39–45
11. Takazawa T, Mitsuhata H, Mertes PM. Sugammadex and rocuronium-induced anaphylaxis. *J Anesth* 2016; **30**: 290–7
12. Harper NJN, Cook TM, Garcez T, et al. Anaesthesia, surgery, and life-threatening allergic reactions: epidemiology and clinical features of perioperative anaphylaxis in the 6th National Audit Project (NAP6). *Br J Anaesth* 2018; **121**: 159–71
13. Lobera T, Audicana MT, Pozo MD, et al. Study of hypersensitivity reactions and anaphylaxis during anesthesia in Spain. *J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol* 2008; **18**: 350–6
14. Ebo DG, Hagendorens MM, Bridts CH, De Clerck LS, Stevens WJ. Allergic reactions occurring during anaesthesia: diagnostic approach. *Acta Clin Belg* 2004; **59**: 34–43
15. Mota I, Gaspar A, Benito-Garcia F, Correia M, Chambel M, Morais-Almeida M. Drug-induced anaphylaxis: seven-year single-center survey. *Eur Ann Allergy Clin Immunol* 2018; **50**: 211–6
16. Lapisatepun W, Charuluxananan S, Kusumaphanyo C, Ittichaikulthol W, Suksompong S, Ratanachai P. The Thai anaesthesia incident monitoring study of perioperative allergic reactions: an analysis of 1996 incidents reports. *J Med Assoc Thai* 2008; **91**: 1524–30
17. Saager L, Turan A, Egan C, et al. Incidence of intraoperative hypersensitivity reactions: a registry analysis: a registry analysis. *Anesthesiology* 2015; **122**: 551–9
18. Florvaag E, Johansson SG, Oman H, et al. Prevalence of IgE antibodies to morphine. Relation to the high and low incidences of NMBA anaphylaxis in Norway and Sweden, respectively. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2005; **49**: 437–44
19. Tacquard C, Collange O, Gomis P, et al. Anaesthetic hypersensitivity reactions in France between 2011 and 2012: the 10th GERAP epidemiologic survey. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2017; **61**: 290–9
20. Dong SW, Mertes PM, Petitpain N, Hasdenteufel F, Malinovsky JM. Hypersensitivity reactions during anaesthesia. Results from the ninth French survey (2005–2007). *Minerva Anesthesiol* 2012; **78**: 868–78
21. Mertes PM, Malinovsky JM, Mouton-Faivre C, et al. Anaphylaxis to dyes during the perioperative period: reports of 14 clinical cases. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2008; **122**: 348–52
22. Garvey LH, Kroigaard M, Poulsen LK, et al. IgE-mediated allergy to chlorhexidine. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2007; **120**: 409–15
23. Galletly DC, Treuren BC. Anaphylactoid reactions during anaesthesia. Seven years' experience of intradermal testing. *Anaesthesia* 1985; **40**: 329–33
24. Savic LC, Kaura V, Yusaf M, et al. Incidence of suspected perioperative anaphylaxis: a multicenter snapshot study. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2015; **3**: 454–5. e1
25. Gibbs NM, Sadleir PH, Clarke RC, Platt PR. Survival from perioperative anaphylaxis in Western Australia 2000–2009. *Br J Anaesth* 2013; **111**: 589–93
26. Charuluxananan S, Punjasawadwong Y, Suraseranivongse S, et al. The Thai Anesthesia Incidents Study (Thai Study) of anesthetic outcomes: II. Anesthetic profiles and adverse events. *J Med Assoc Thai* 2005; **88**: S14–29
27. Escolano F, Valero A, Huguet J, et al. Prospective epidemiologic study of perioperative anaphylactoid reactions occurring in Catalonia (1996–7). *Rev Esp Anesthesiol Reanim* 2002; **49**: 286–93
28. Mitsuhata H, Matsumoto S, Hasegawa J. The epidemiology and clinical features of anaphylactic and anaphylactoid reactions in the perioperative period in Japan. *Masui* 1992; **41**: 1664–9
29. Laxenaire MC, Moneret-Vautrin DA, Boileau S, Moeller R. Adverse reactions to intravenous agents in anaesthesia in France. *Klin Wochenschr* 1982; **60**: 1006–9
30. Watkins J. Adverse anaesthetic reactions. An update from a proposed national reporting and advisory service. *Anaesthesia* 1985; **40**: 797–800
31. Berroa F, Lafuente A, Javaloyes G, et al. The incidence of perioperative hypersensitivity reactions: a single-center, prospective, cohort study. *Anesth Analg* 2015; **121**: 117–23
32. Dea Ebo. Molecular mechanisms and pathophysiology of perioperative hypersensitivity and anaphylaxis. *Br J Anaesth* 2019; **123**: e38–49
33. Volcheck GW, Mertes PM. Local and general anesthetics immediate hypersensitivity reactions. *Immunol Allergy Clin North Am* 2014; **34**: 525–46 [viii]
34. McNeil BD, Pundir P, Meeker S, et al. Identification of a mast-cell-specific receptor crucial for pseudo-allergic drug reactions. *Nature* 2015; **519**: 237–41
35. Mertes PM, Volcheck GW, Garvey LH, et al. Epidemiology of perioperative anaphylaxis. *Presse Med* 2016; **45**: 758–67
36. Laxenaire MC. [Epidemiology of anesthetic anaphylactoid reactions. Fourth multicenter survey (July 1994–December 1996)]. *Ann Fr Anesth Reanim* 1999; **18**: 796–809 (in French)
37. Spoerl D, Nigolian H, Czarnetzki C, Harr T. Reclassifying anaphylaxis to neuromuscular blocking agents based on the presumed patho-mechanism: IgE-mediated, pharmacological adverse reaction or "innate hypersensitivity"? *Int J Mol Sci* 2017; **18**
38. Mertes PM, Alla F, Trechot P, Auroy Y, Jouglu E. Anaphylaxis during anaesthesia in France: an 8-year national survey. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2011; **128**: 366–73
39. Reitter M, Petitpain N, Latarche C, et al. Fatal anaphylaxis with neuromuscular blocking agents: a risk factor and management analysis. *Allergy* 2014; **69**: 954–9
40. Harper NJN, Cook TM, Garcez T, et al. Anaesthesia, surgery, and life-threatening allergic reactions: management and outcomes in the 6th National Audit Project (NAP6). *Paediatr Anaesth* 2018; **121**: 172–88
41. Garvey LH, Belhage B, Kroigaard M, Husum B, Malling HJ, Mosbech H. Treatment with epinephrine (adrenaline) in

- suspected anaphylaxis during anesthesia in Denmark. *Anesthesiology* 2011; **115**: 111–6
42. Mitsuhata H, Hasegawa J, Matsumoto S, Ogawa R. The epidemiology and clinical features of anaphylactic and anaphylactoid reactions in the perioperative period in Japan: a survey with a questionnaire of 529 hospitals approved by Japan Society of Anesthesiology. *Masui* 1992; **41**: 1825–31
  43. Hepner DL, Castells MC. Anaphylaxis during the perioperative period. *Anesth Analg* 2003; **97**: 1381–95
  44. Antunes J, Kochuyt AM, Ceuppens JL. Perioperative allergic reactions: experience in a Flemish referral centre. *Allergol Immunopathol (Madr)* 2014; **42**: 348–54
  45. Leysen J, De Witte L, Bridts CH, Ebo DG. Anaphylaxis during general anaesthesia: a 10-year survey at the University hospital of Antwerp. *P Belg Roy Acad Med* 2013; **2**: 12
  46. Laxenaire MC, Mertes PM. Anaphylaxis during anaesthesia. Results of a two-year survey in France. *Br J Anaesth* 2001; **87**: 549–58
  47. Mertes PM, Laxenaire MC. Anaphylactic and anaphylactoid reactions occurring during anaesthesia in France. Seventh epidemiologic survey (January 2001–December 2002). *Ann Fr Anesth Reanim* 2004; **23**: 1133–43
  48. Mertes PM, Laxenaire MC, Alla F. Anaphylactic and anaphylactoid reactions occurring during anesthesia in France in 1999–2000. *Anesthesiology* 2003; **99**: 536–45
  49. Cho YJ, Ju JW, Sim H, et al. Intraoperative anaphylaxis to neuromuscular blocking agents: the incidence over 9 years at two tertiary hospitals in South Korea: a retrospective observational study. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 2016; **33**: 368–78
  50. Gurrieri C, Weingarten TN, Martin DP, et al. Allergic reactions during anesthesia at a large United States referral center. *Anesth Analg* 2011; **113**: 1202–12
  51. Guyer AC, Saff RR, Conroy M, et al. Comprehensive allergy evaluation is useful in the subsequent care of patients with drug hypersensitivity reactions during anesthesia. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2015; **3**: 94–100
  52. Gonzalez-Estrada A, Pien LC, Zell K, Wang XF, Lang DM. Antibiotics are an important identifiable cause of perioperative anaphylaxis in the United States. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2015; **3**: 101–105.e1
  53. de Pater GH, Florvaag E, Johansson SG, Irgens A, Petersen MN, Guttormsen AB. Six years without pholcodine; Norwegians are significantly less IgE-sensitized and clinically more tolerant to neuromuscular blocking agents. *Allergy* 2017; **72**: 813–9
  54. Florvaag E, Johansson SG, Irgens A, de Pater GH. IgE-sensitization to the cough suppressant pholcodine and the effects of its withdrawal from the Norwegian market. *Allergy* 2011; **66**: 955–60
  55. Baldo BA, Fisher MM. Substituted ammonium ions as allergenic determinants in drug allergy. *Nature* 1983; **306**: 262–4
  56. Baldo BA, Fisher MM, Pham NH. On the origin and specificity of antibodies to neuromuscular blocking (muscle relaxant) drugs: an immunochemical perspective. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2009; **39**: 325–44
  57. Mertes PM, Aimone-Gastin I, Gueant-Rodriguez RM, et al. Hypersensitivity reactions to neuromuscular blocking agents. *Curr Pharm Des* 2008; **14**: 2809–25
  58. Petitpain N, Argouillon L, Masmoudi K, et al. Neuromuscular blocking agents induced anaphylaxis: results and trends of a French Pharmacovigilance survey from 2000 to 2012. *Allergy* 2018
  59. Chiriarc AM, Tacquard C, Fadhel NB, et al. Safety of subsequent general anaesthesia in patients allergic to neuromuscular blocking agents: value of allergy skin testing. *Br J Anaesth* 2018; **120**: 1437–40
  60. Tacquard C, Laroche D, Stenger R, et al. Diagnostic procedure after an immediate hypersensitivity reaction in the operating room. *Presse Med* 2016; **45**: 784–90
  61. Mertes PM, Volcheck GW. Anaphylaxis to neuromuscular-blocking drugs: all neuromuscular-blocking drugs are not the same. *Anesthesiology* 2015; **122**: 5–7
  62. Guttormsen AB. Allergic reactions during anaesthesia — increased attention to the problem in Denmark and Norway. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2001; **45**: 1189–90
  63. Dong S, Acouetey DS, Gueant-Rodriguez RM, et al. Prevalence of IgE against neuromuscular blocking agents in hairdressers and bakers. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2013; **43**: 1256–62
  64. Florvaag E, Johansson SG. The Pholcodine Case. Cough medicines, IgE-sensitization, and anaphylaxis: a devious connection. *World Allergy Organ J* 2012; **5**: 73–8
  65. Harboe T, Johansson SG, Florvaag E, Oman H. Pholcodine exposure raises serum IgE in patients with previous anaphylaxis to neuromuscular blocking agents. *Allergy* 2007; **62**: 1445–50
  66. Johansson SG, Florvaag E, Oman H, et al. National pholcodine consumption and prevalence of IgE-sensitization: a multicentre study. *Allergy* 2010; **65**: 498–502
  67. Katelaris CH, Kurosawa M, Moon HB, Borres M, Florvaag E, Johansson SG. Pholcodine consumption and immunoglobulin E-sensitization in atopics from Australia, Korea, and Japan. *Asia Pac Allergy* 2014; **4**: 86–90
  68. Johansson SG, Oman H, Nopp A, Florvaag E. Pholcodine caused anaphylaxis in Sweden 30 years ago. *Allergy* 2009; **64**: 820–1
  69. Miyazaki Y, Sunaga H, Kida K, et al. Incidence of anaphylaxis associated with sugammadex. *Anesth Analg* 2018; **126**: 1505–8
  70. Takazawa T, Lida H. Current status of sugammadex usage and the occurrence of sugammadex-induced anaphylaxis in Japan. *APSF Newsl* 2018; **33**: 11–2
  71. Corda D. The anaphylactic risk. *APSF Newsl* 2018; **33**: 11–2
  72. de Kam PJ, Nolte H, Good S, et al. Sugammadex hypersensitivity and underlying mechanisms: a randomised study of healthy non-anaesthetised volunteers. *Br J Anaesth* 2018; **121**: 758–67
  73. Min KC, Bondiskey P, Schulz V, et al. Hypersensitivity incidence after sugammadex administration in healthy subjects: a randomised controlled trial. *Br J Anaesth* 2018; **121**: 749–57
  74. Savic L, Savic S, Hopkins PM. Sugammadex: the sting in the tail? *Br J Anaesth* 2018; **121**: 694–7
  75. Hotta E, Tamagawa-Mineoka R, Masuda K, et al. Anaphylaxis caused by gamma-cyclodextrin in sugammadex. *Allergol Int* 2016; **65**: 356–8
  76. Munro IC, Newberne PM, Young VR, Bar A. Safety assessment of gamma-cyclodextrin. *Regul Toxicol Pharmacol* 2004; **39**: S3–13
  77. Tsur A, Kalansky A. Hypersensitivity associated with sugammadex administration: a systematic review. *Anaesthesia* 2014; **69**: 1251–7

78. Ho G, Clarke RC, Sadleir PH, Platt PR. The first case report of anaphylaxis caused by the inclusion complex of rocuronium and sugammadex. *A A Case Rep* 2016; 7: 190–2
79. Yamaoka M, Deguchi M, Ninomiya K, Kurasako T, Matsumoto M. A suspected case of rocuronium–sugammadex complex-induced anaphylactic shock after cesarean section. *J Anesth* 2017; 31: 148–51
80. Okuno A, Matsuki Y, Tabata M, Shigemi K. A suspected case of coronary vasospasm induced by anaphylactic shock caused by rocuronium–sugammadex complex. *J Clin Anesth* 2018; 48: 7
81. Kim GH, Choi WS, Kim JE, et al. Anaphylactic shock after sugammadex administration, induced by formation of a sugammadex–rocuronium complex. *Korean J Anesthesiol* 2018
82. Baldo BA. Anaphylaxis caused by sugammadex–rocuronium inclusion complex: what is the basis of the allergenic recognition? *J Clin Anesth* 2018; 54: 48–9
83. Asserhoj LL, Mosbech H, Kroigaard M, Garvey LH. No evidence for contraindications to the use of propofol in adults allergic to egg, soy or peanutdagger. *Br J Anaesth* 2016; 116: 77–82
84. Molina-Infante J, Arias A, Vara-Brenes D, et al. Propofol administration is safe in adult eosinophilic esophagitis patients sensitized to egg, soy, or peanut. *Allergy* 2014; 69: 388–94
85. Richard C, Beaudouin E, Moneret-Vautrin DA, Kohler C, Nguyen-Grosjean VM, Jacquenet S. Severe anaphylaxis to Propofol: first case of evidence of sensitization to soy oil. *Eur Ann Allergy Clin Immunol* 2016; 48: 103–6
86. Murphy A, Campbell DE, Baines D, Mehr S. Allergic reactions to propofol in egg-allergic children. *Anesth Analg* 2011; 113: 140–4
87. Harper NJ. Propofol and food allergy. *Br J Anaesth* 2016; 116: 11–3
88. Lansu K, Karpiak J, Liu J, et al. In silico design of novel probes for the atypical opioid receptor MRGPRX2. *Nat Chem Biol* 2017; 13: 529–36
89. Navines-Ferrer A, Serrano-Candelas E, Lafuente A, Munoz-Cano R, Martin M. MRGPRX2-mediated mast cell response to drugs used in perioperative procedures and anaesthesia. *Sci Report* 8 2018; 8: 11628
90. Blunk JA, Schmelz M, Zeck S, Skov P, Likar R, Koppert W. Opioid-induced mast cell activation and vascular responses is not mediated by mu-opioid receptors: an in vivo microdialysis study in human skin. *Anesth Analg* 2004; 98: 364–70 [table of contents]
91. Baldo BA, Pham NH. Histamine-releasing and allergenic properties of opioid analgesic drugs: resolving the two. *Anaesth Intensive Care* 2012; 40: 216–35
92. Swerts S, Van Gasse A, Leysen J, et al. Allergy to illicit drugs and narcotics. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2014; 44: 307–18
93. Nasser SM, Ewan PW. Opiate-sensitivity: clinical characteristics and the role of skin prick testing. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2001; 31: 1014–20
94. Van Gasse AL, Hagendorens MM, Sabato V, Bridts CH, De Clerck LS, Ebo DG. IgE to poppy seed and morphine are not useful tools to diagnose opiate allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2015; 3: 396–9
95. Fisher MM, Baldo BA. The incidence and clinical features of anaphylactic reactions during anesthesia in Australia. *Ann Fr Anesth Reanim* 1993; 12: 97–104
96. Lieberman P. Anaphylactic reactions during surgical and medical procedures. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2002; 110: S64–9
97. Kvisselgaard AD, Mosbech HF, Fransson S, Garvey LH. Risk of Immediate-type allergy to local anesthetics is overestimated—results from 5 years of provocation testing in a Danish allergy clinic. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2018; 6: 1217–23
98. Fisher MM, Bowey CJ. Alleged allergy to local anaesthetics. *Anaesth Intensive Care* 1997; 25: 611–4
99. Malinovsky JM, Chiriac AM, Tacquard C, Mertes PM, Demoly P. Allergy to local anesthetics: reality or myth? *Presse Med* 2016; 45: 753–7
100. Saff RR. Immediate local anesthetic reactions: too quick to point the finger? *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2018; 6: 1224–5
101. Mertes PM, Lambert M, Gueant-Rodriguez RM, et al. Perioperative anaphylaxis. *Immunol Allergy Clin North Am* 2009; 29: 429–51
102. Christiansen IS, Kroigaard M, Mosbech H, Skov PS, Poulsen LK, Garvey LH. Clinical and diagnostic features of perioperative hypersensitivity to cefuroxime. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2015; 45: 807–14
103. Chong YY, Caballero MR, Lukawska J, Dugue P. Anaphylaxis during general anaesthesia: one-year survey from a British allergy clinic. *Singapore Med J* 2008; 49: 483–7
104. Torres MJ, Blanca M, Fernandez J, et al. Diagnosis of immediate allergic reactions to beta-lactam antibiotics. *Allergy* 2003; 58: 961–72
105. Kim MH, Lee JM. Diagnosis and management of immediate hypersensitivity reactions to cephalosporins. *Allergy Asthma Immunol Res* 2014; 6: 485–95
106. Macy E. Penicillin allergy: optimizing diagnostic protocols, public health implications, and future research needs. *Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol* 2015; 15: 308–13
107. Uyttebroek AP, Decuyper II, Bridts CH, et al. Cefazolin hypersensitivity: toward optimized diagnosis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2016; 4: 1232–6
108. Ebo DG, Faber M, Elst J, et al. In vitro diagnosis of immediate drug hypersensitivity during anesthesia: a review of the literature. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2018; 6: 1176–84
109. Marinho S, Kemp H, Cook TM, et al. Cross-sectional study of perioperative drug and allergen exposure in UK practice in 2016: the 6th National Audit Project (NAP6) Allergen Survey. *Br J Anaesth* 2018; 121: 146–58
110. Krishna MT, Huissoon AP, Li M, et al. Enhancing antibiotic stewardship by tackling "spurious" penicillin allergy. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2017; 47: 1362–73
111. Trubiano JA, Thursky KA, Stewardson AJ, et al. Impact of an integrated antibiotic allergy testing program on antimicrobial stewardship: a multicenter evaluation. *Clin Infect Dis* 2017; 65: 166–74
112. Novalbos A, Sastre J, Cuesta J, et al. Lack of allergic cross-reactivity to cephalosporins among patients allergic to penicillins. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2001; 31: 438–43
113. Haslam S, Yen D, Dvirnik N, Engen D. Cefazolin use in patients who report a non-IgE mediated penicillin allergy: a retrospective look at adverse reactions in arthroplasty. *Iowa Orthop J* 2012; 32: 100–3
114. Savic, et al. Management of the surgical patient with a label of penicillin allergy. *Br J Anaesth* 2019; 123: e82–94

115. Trubiano JA, Stone CA, Grayson ML, et al. The 3 Cs of antibiotic allergy—classification, cross-reactivity, and collaboration. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2017; **5**: 1532–42
116. Harper NJ, Dixon T, Dugue P, et al. Suspected anaphylactic reactions associated with anaesthesia. *Anaesthesia* 2009; **64**: 199–211
117. Stern G. Überempfindlichkeit gegen Kautschuk als Ursache von Urticaria und Quinckeschem Ödem. *Klin Wochenschr* 1927; **6**: 1096–7
118. Grimm A. Überempfindlichkeit gegen Kautschuk als Ursache von Urticaria und Quinckeschem Ödem. *Klin Wochenschr* 1927; **6**: 1479
119. Turjanmaa K, Reunala T, Tuimala R, Karkkainen T. Severe IgE-mediated allergy to surgical gloves. *Allergy* 1984; **39**: 35
120. Slater JE. Rubber anaphylaxis. *N Engl J Med* 1989; **320**: 1126–30
121. Moneret-Vautrin DA, Mata E, Gueant JL, Turgeman D, Laxenaire MC. High risk of anaphylactic shock during surgery for spina bifida. *Lancet* 1990; **335**: 865–6
122. Raulf-Heimsoth M, Rihs HP, Rozynek P, et al. Quantitative analysis of immunoglobulin E reactivity profiles in patients allergic or sensitized to natural rubber latex (*Hevea brasiliensis*). *Clin Exp Allergy* 2007; **37**: 1657–67
123. Raulf M. The latex story. *Chem Immunol Allergy* 2014; **100**: 248–55
124. Michael T, Niggemann B, Moers A, Seidel U, Wahn U, Scheffner D. Risk factors for latex allergy in patients with spina bifida. *Clin Exp Allergy* 1996; **26**: 934–9
125. Ausili E, Tabacco F, Focarelli B, Nucera E, Patriarca G, Rendeli C. Prevalence of latex allergy in spina bifida: genetic and environmental risk factors. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci* 2007; **11**: 149–53
126. Cremer R, Lorbacher M, Hering F, Engelskirchen R. Natural rubber latex sensitisation and allergy in patients with spina bifida, urogenital disorders and oesophageal atresia compared with a normal paediatric population. *Eur J Pediatr Surg* 2007; **17**: 194–8
127. Bousquet J, Flahault A, Vandenplas O, et al. Natural rubber latex allergy among health care workers: a systematic review of the evidence. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2006; **118**: 447–54
128. Charous BL, Hamilton RG, Yunginger JW. Occupational latex exposure: characteristics of contact and systemic reactions in 47 workers. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1994; **94**: 12–8
129. Meglio P, Arabito E, Plantamura M, Businco L. Prevalence of latex allergy and evaluation of some risk factors in a population of atopic children. *J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol* 2002; **12**: 250–6
130. Wudy AE, Negro C, Adami A, Larese Filon F. Atopic status and latex sensitization in a cohort of 1,628 students of health care faculties. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 2017; **118**: 603–7
131. Wagner S, Breiteneder H. The latex-fruit syndrome. *Biochem Soc Trans* 2002; **30**: 935–40
132. Blanco C. Latex-fruit syndrome. *Curr Allergy Asthma Rep* 2003; **3**: 47–53
133. Draisci G, Nucera E, Pollastrini E, et al. Anaphylactic reactions during cesarean section. *Int J Obstet Anesth* 2007; **16**: 63–7
134. Draisci G, Zanfini BA, Nucera E, et al. Latex sensitization: a special risk for the obstetric population? *Anesthesiology* 2011; **114**: 565–9
135. Habre W, Disma N, Virag K, et al. Incidence of severe critical events in paediatric anaesthesia (APRICOT): a prospective multicentre observational study in 261 hospitals in Europe. *Lancet Respir Med* 2017; **5**: 412–25
136. Blaabjerg MS, Andersen KE, Bindslev-Jensen C, Mortz CG. Decrease in the rate of sensitization and clinical allergy to natural rubber latex. *Contact Dermat* 2015; **73**: 21–8
137. Supapvanich C, Povey AC, De Vocht F. Latex sensitization and risk factors in female nurses in Thai governmental hospitals. *Int J Occup Med Environ Health* 2014; **27**: 93–103
138. Garvey LH. Old, new and hidden causes of perioperative hypersensitivity. *Curr Pharm Des* 2016; **22**: 6814–24
139. Kowalski ML, Asero R, Bavbek S, et al. Classification and practical approach to the diagnosis and management of hypersensitivity to nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. *Allergy* 2013; **68**: 1219–32
140. de Paramo BJ, Gancedo SQ, Cuevas M, Camo IP, Martin JA, Cosmes EL. Paracetamol (acetaminophen) hypersensitivity. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 2000; **85**: 508–11
141. Jain SS, Green S, Rose M. Anaphylaxis following intravenous paracetamol: the problem is the solution. *Anaesth Intensive Care* 2015; **43**: 779–81
142. Mertes PM, Malinovsky JM, Jouffroy L, et al. Reducing the risk of anaphylaxis during anaesthesia: 2011 updated guidelines for clinical practice. *J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol* 2011; **21**: 442–53
143. Okano M, Nomura M, Hata S, et al. Anaphylactic symptoms due to chlorhexidine gluconate. *Arch Dermatol* 1989; **125**: 50–2
144. Infection control NICE. Prevention of healthcare-associated infections in primary and community care. *Natl Inst Health Clin Excell Guidance* 2003 2012. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/Guidance/CG139>. [Accessed 12 August 2018]
145. Odedra KM, Farooque S. Chlorhexidine: an unrecognised cause of anaphylaxis. *Postgrad Med J* 2014; **90**: 709–14
146. Krishna MT, York M, Chin T, et al. Multi-centre retrospective analysis of anaphylaxis during general anaesthesia in the United Kingdom: aetiology and diagnostic performance of acute serum tryptase. *Clin Exp Immunol* 2014; **178**: 399–404
147. Sharp G, Green S, Rose M. Chlorhexidine-induced anaphylaxis in surgical patients: a review of the literature. *ANZ J Surg* 2016; **86**: 237–43
148. Oda T, Hamasaki J, Kanda N, Mikami K. Anaphylactic shock induced by an antiseptic-coated central venous [correction of nervous] catheter. *Anesthesiology* 1997; **87**: 1242–4
149. Nightingale SL. From the food and drug administration. *Jama* 1998; **279**: 1684
150. Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA). *Medicines Saf Update* June 2012; **3**(Number 3). Available from: <https://www.tga.gov.au/publication-issue/medicines-safety-update-volume-3-number-3-june-2012>. [Accessed 19 September 2018]
151. Terazawa E, Shimonaka H, Nagase K, Masue T, Dohi S. Severe anaphylactic reaction due to a chlorhexidine-impregnated central venous catheter. *Anesthesiology* 1998; **89**: 1296–8
152. Peutrell JM. Anaphylactoid reaction to topical chlorhexidine during anaesthesia. *Anaesthesia* 1992; **47**: 1013
153. Ohtoshi T, Yamauchi N, Tadokoro K, et al. IgE antibody-mediated shock reaction caused by topical application of chlorhexidine. *Clin Allergy* 1986; **16**: 155–61
154. *Guidelines for the prevention of intravascular catheter-related infections* 2011. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/infectioncontrol/guidelines/pdf/bsi/bsi-guidelines-H.pdf>. [Accessed 12 August 2018]

155. Bahal S, Sharma S, Garvey LH, Nagendran V. Anaphylaxis after disinfection with 2% chlorhexidine wand applicator. *BMJ Case Rep* 2017; 2017
156. Rose MA, Garcez T, Savic S, et al. Chlorhexidine allergy in the perioperative setting: a narrative review. *Br J Anaesth* 2019; 123: e95–103
157. Caballero MR, Lukawska J, Dugue P. A hidden cause of perioperative anaphylaxis. *J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol* 2010; 20: 353–4
158. Le Pabic F, Sainte-Laudy J, Blanchard N, Moneret-Vautrin DA. First case of anaphylaxis to iodinated povidone. *Allergy* 2003; 58: 826–7
159. Kopp WL. Anaphylaxis from alphazurine 2G during lymphography. *JAMS* 1966; 198: 668–9
160. Sinclair DJ, Perera FA. Allergic reactions: following patent blue dye injection. *Can Med Assoc J* 1969; 101: 100–1
161. Brenet O, Lalourcey L, Queinnec M, et al. Hypersensitivity reactions to Patent Blue V in breast cancer surgery: a prospective multicentre study. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2013; 57: 106–11
162. Ishiyama T, Kotoda M, Asano N, et al. The effects of Patent Blue dye on peripheral and cerebral oxyhaemoglobin saturations. *Anaesthesia* 2015; 70: 429–33
163. Scherer K, Studer W, Figueiredo V, Bircher AJ. Anaphylaxis to isosulfan blue and cross-reactivity to patent blue V: case report and review of the nomenclature of vital blue dyes. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 2006; 96: 497–500
164. Keller B, Yawalkar N, Pichler C, Braathen LR, Hunger RE. Hypersensitivity reaction against patent blue during sentinel lymph node removal in three melanoma patients. *Am J Surg* 2007; 193: 122–4
165. Ebo DG, Wets RD, Spiessens TK, Bridts CH, Stevens WJ. Flow-assisted diagnosis of anaphylaxis to patent blue. *Allergy* 2005; 60: 703–4
166. Barthelmes L, Goyal A, Newcombe RG, McNeill F, Mansel RE. Adverse reactions to patent blue V dye — the NEW START and ALMANAC experience. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2010; 36: 399–403
167. Platt P, Roberts L. Anaphylaxis to patent blue dye—misadventure or misdemeanour? *Anaesth Intensive Care* 2011; 39: 166–7
168. Montgomery LL, Thorne AC, Van Zee KJ, et al. Isosulfan blue dye reactions during sentinel lymph node mapping for breast cancer. *Anesth Analg* 2002; 95: 385–8 [table of contents]
169. Paulinelli RR, Freitas-Junior R, Rahal RM, et al. A prospective randomized trial comparing patent blue and methylene blue for the detection of the sentinel lymph node in breast cancer patients. *Rev Assoc Med Bras* 1992; 2017: 118–23
170. Rzymiski P, Wozniak J, Opala T, Wilczak M, Sajdak S. Anaphylactic reaction to methylene blue dye after laparoscopic chromopertubation. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2003; 81: 71–2
171. Mertes PM, Demoly P, Alperovitch A, et al. Methylene blue-treated plasma: an increased allergy risk? *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2012; 130: 808–12
172. Dewachter P, Mouton-Faivre C, Trechot P, Lleu JC, Mertes PM. Severe anaphylactic shock with methylene blue instillation. *Anesth Analg* 2005; 101: 149–50 [table of contents]
173. Laxenaire MC, Charpentier C, Feldman L. Anaphylactoid reactions to colloid plasma substitutes: incidence, risk factors, mechanisms. A French multicenter prospective study. *Ann Fr Anesth Reanim* 1994; 13: 301–10
174. Barron ME, Wilkes MM, Navickis RJ. A systematic review of the comparative safety of colloids. *Arch Surg* 2004; 139: 552–63
175. Lorenz W, Duda D, Dick W, et al. Incidence and clinical importance of perioperative histamine release: randomised study of volume loading and antihistamines after induction of anaesthesia. Trial Group Mainz/Marburg. *Lancet* 1994; 343: 933–40
176. Hedin H, Ljungstrom KG. Prevention of dextran anaphylaxis. Ten years experience with hapten dextran. *Int Arch Allergy Immunol* 1997; 113: 358–9
177. Kemp HI, Cook TM, Thomas M, Harper NJN. UK anaesthetists' perspectives and experiences of severe perioperative anaphylaxis: NAP6 baseline survey. *Br J Anaesth* 2017; 119: 132–9
178. Tacquard C, Boudjedir K, Carlier M, Muller JY, Gomis P, Mertes PM. Hypersensitivity transfusion reactions due to IgA deficiency are rare according to French hemovigilance data. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2017; 140: 884–5
179. Mertes PM, Bazin A, Alla F, et al. Hypersensitivity reactions to blood components: document issued by the allergy committee of the French medicines and healthcare products regulatory agency. *J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol* 2011; 21: 171–8
180. Squires JE. Risks of transfusion. *South Med J* 2011; 104: 762–9
181. Rapport ANSM. *d'activité hémovigilance* 2016. Available from: [https://ansm.sante.fr/var/ansm\\_site/storage/original/application/878213f5896bb59ca330bca39164ee16.pdf](https://ansm.sante.fr/var/ansm_site/storage/original/application/878213f5896bb59ca330bca39164ee16.pdf). [Accessed 8 December 2018]
182. Muniz-Diaz E, Puig L. Allergic and anaphylactic reactions to methylene-blue-treated plasma in Catalonia in the period 2008–2013. *Blood Transfus* 2014; 12: 628–30
183. Mitsuhata H, Horiguchi Y, Saitoh J, et al. An anaphylactic reaction to topical fibrin glue. *Anesthesiology* 1994; 81: 1074–7
184. Oswald AM, Joly LM, Gury C, Disdet M, Leduc V, Kanny G. Fatal intraoperative anaphylaxis related to aprotinin after local application of fibrin glue. *Anesthesiology* 2003; 99: 762–3
185. Dietrich W, Ebell A, Busley R, Boulesteix AL. Aprotinin and anaphylaxis: analysis of 12,403 exposures to aprotinin in cardiac surgery. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2007; 84: 1144–50
186. Beierlein W, Scheule AM, Dietrich W, Ziemer G. Forty years of clinical aprotinin use: a review of 124 hypersensitivity reactions. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2005; 79: 741–8
187. Levy JH, Adkinson Jr NF. Anaphylaxis during cardiac surgery: implications for clinicians. *Anesth Analg* 2008; 106: 392–403
188. Valchanov K, Falter F, George S, et al. Three cases of anaphylaxis to protamine: management of anticoagulation reversal. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth* 2019; 33: 482–6
189. Levy JH, Schwieger IM, Zaidan JR, Faraj BA, Weintraub WS. Evaluation of patients at risk for protamine reactions. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1989; 98: 200–4
190. Levy JH, Zaidan JR, Faraj B. Prospective evaluation of risk of protamine reactions in patients with NPH insulin-dependent diabetes. *Anesth Analg* 1986; 65: 739–42