

Review Article

Platinum hypersensitivity and desensitization

Shingo Miyamoto^{1,*}, Rika Okada², and Kazumichi Ando³

¹Department of Medical Oncology, Japanese Red Cross Medical Center, Shibuya, Tokyo, ²Department of Allergy and Rheumatology, Japanese Red Cross Medical Center, Shibuya, Tokyo, and ³Department of Gynecology, Japanese Red Cross Medical Center, Shibuya, Tokyo, Japan

*For reprints and all correspondence: Shingo Miyamoto, Department of Medical Oncology, Japanese Red Cross Medical Center, 4-1-22 Hiroo, Shibuya, Tokyo 150-8935, Japan. E-mail: aaa17580@pop06.odn.ne.jp

Received 21 February 2015; Accepted 3 May 2015

Abstract

Platinum agents are drugs used for various types of cancer. With increased frequency of administration of platinum agents, hypersensitivity reactions appear more frequently, occurring in over 25% of cases from the seventh cycle or second line onward. It then becomes difficult to conduct treatment using these agents. Various approaches have been investigated to address hypersensitivity reactions to platinum agents. Desensitization, which gradually increases the concentration of the anticancer drug considered to be the antigen until the target dosage, has been reported as being particularly effective, with a success rate of 80–100%. The aims of this paper are to present the current findings regarding hypersensitivity reactions to platinum agents and to discuss attempts of using desensitization against hypersensitivity reactions worldwide.

Key words: platinum, hypersensitivity, desensitization

Introduction

Chemotherapy including platinum agents is effective against a large number of cancers and is used widely. By forming crosslinks with DNA bases within cancer cells, platinum agents act to inhibit DNA replication; this leads to suppression of division and proliferation of cancer cells, thus killing these cells.

Cisplatin, a first-generation platinum agent, is a non-natural compound that was serendipitously discovered during a work conducted by Rosenberg et al. (1). For its efficacy, it is recommended that treatment be discontinued after a maximum of six cycles when treating non-small cell lung cancer (2,3). On the other hand, some Phase 3 trials have been conducted using this agent for gastric cancer, in which it has been administered continuously until progression (4,5), with a reported median number of 4 cycles and a maximum of 11 cycles (4).

Carboplatin, a second-generation platinum agent, is administered depending on kidney function because it can be administered to patients with reduced kidney function. Additionally, as it does not require large-volume transfusion, it can be administered to outpatients and is used in place of cisplatin for the treatment of many types of cancer. In ovarian cancer, chemotherapy including carboplatin is used as a standard primary treatment. It has been reported that, in cases in

which relapse occurs >6 months following this primary treatment, re-treatment with carboplatin-containing chemotherapy yields favorable results (6,7).

Oxaliplatin, a third-generation platinum agent, is an integral drug used for colorectal cancer (8–11) and pancreatic cancer (12). It is administered either until treatment discontinuation due to toxicity or is continually administered until progression. One of the characteristics of oxaliplatin that differentiates it from other platinum agents is an increased frequency of cold-sensitive dysesthesia and peripheral neuropathy, which may lead to discontinuation of treatment (10).

Clinicians occasionally encounter hypersensitivity reactions (HSRs) to platinum agents. Hypersensitivity to a chemotherapeutic agent is defined as unexpected reactions that cannot be explained by the known toxicity profile of the drug (13). It has been known that, as the administration of platinum agents becomes more frequent, the incidence of HSRs will also increase (14). HSRs can lead to life-threatening conditions and thus require immediate treatment. Consequently, when patients have experienced HSRs, clinicians must choose, based on their consideration of the risk of causing even more serious adverse reactions or anaphylaxis, whether to continue with the same treatment or to suspend treatment and

to search for other treatment options, although it is possible that chemotherapy with platinum agents is the only effective treatment option. In recurrent ovarian cancer in particular, carboplatin is associated with the 'platinum-sensitivity relapse' concept and oxaliplatin is used as the key drug for adjuvant therapy, first-line therapy and second-line therapy for colorectal cancer. As continued re-administration of these platinum agents contributes to prolonged survival periods, clinicians contemplate rechallenge with these platinum agents.

Approaches to address HSRs include reducing the infusion rate (15), administering premedication (16), switching to a different platinum agent (17,18) and skin testing (19). However, in particular, desensitization is an effective method (20).

The aims of this paper are to present the current findings regarding HSRs to platinum agents and to discuss attempts of using desensitization against HSRs worldwide.

Mechanism

Based on their mechanism of development, HSRs are classified into either allergic reactions, which involve an immunological mechanism, or non-allergic cytokine release syndrome (21). Additionally, the type of allergic reaction can be further classified into four categories (Table 1).

Allergic reactions and anaphylaxis are caused by an immunological mechanism and HSRs occur within a relatively short time of the administration of the drug. Such HSRs are of the 'immediate type' and are classified as Gell and Coombs Type I allergies (21,22). On the other hand, cytokine release syndrome occurs due to the binding of the administered drug to circulating immune cells, such as monocytes and macrophages, causing the release of cytokines (23).

Although the mechanism by which platinum agents cause HSRs has not yet been clearly elucidated, they are generally reported as immediate Type I allergies (24). In Type I allergies, mast cells and basophils react via IgE and release chemical messengers such as histamine, leukotrienes and prostaglandins, which in turn cause a variety of symptoms. Among allergic reactions, those with the most severe and rapid onset and fatal large-scale or systemic reactions are called anaphylaxis. Although anaphylaxis is rare, its onset is life-threatening and

necessitates that careful attention and appropriate measures should be taken (25).

One reason why Type I reactions are believed to be closely involved in HSRs is that there exist reports stating that skin testing is effective in diagnosis and prediction of HSRs to platinum agents (19,26,27). Such methods include prick testing, where the skin is pricked with a needle lightly enough such that bleeding does not occur, and then, an antigen-containing fluid is applied at the prick site. Another method is intradermal testing, where 0.02 ml of a diluted antigen-containing fluid is injected into the skin. Some studies have been conducted using intradermal testing alone (26,27); however, other studies have been performed with the safer skin prick testing; these studies then used intradermal testing for the negative cases (19,28), with the latter approach being used in recent studies. Markman et al. (26) reported skin testing as a useful method for predicting HSRs, with anaphylaxis occurring in six of seven skin test-positive patients when retreated with carboplatin, resulting in a negative predictive value of 98.5%. Zanotti et al. (27) also reported that, in a study of 47 patients, those who were negative for the intradermal reaction had a reduced risk of developing HSRs to carboplatin and had milder reactions even when HSRs did occur. However, it was found that the false-negative rate was ~8% (26,29), indicating the limits of the test or the possibility that other mechanisms may contribute to HSRs. At present, skin testing of anticancer drugs as sensitivity tests in patients with no medical history of HSRs to platinum agents is thought to be unethical due to adverse events such as irritant reactions and is not conducted routinely (30).

Rarely, case reports present the possibility that cytotoxic (Type II) hypersensitivity and immune complex (Type III) hypersensitivity contribute to HSRs to platinum agents (15,31–34). Additionally, it has been suggested that cisplatin and carboplatin also induce Type IV hypersensitivity through delayed T-cell sensitization (14). Santini et al. (35) reported that 20 min following the administration of oxaliplatin, cases with chills, stomach pain, diarrhea and fever showed increases in TNF- α and IL-6, suggesting that oxaliplatin may act like a superantigen to stimulate the release of these cytokines. Similar findings have been reported in some other papers (36,37).

In other words, because the pathologies of HSRs to platinum agents are not limited to Type I allergic reactions, clinicians must be

Table 1. Classification of allergic reactions (Gell and Coombs)

Type of HSRs	Antibody	Antigen	Mediators	Skin test	Symptoms
I Immediate type	IgE	Exogenous antigen e.g. house dust, pollen, drug, mite	Histamines Leukotrienes Prostaglandins Platelet activating factor etc.	Immediate	Urticaria Angioedema Bronchospasm Anaphylaxis
II Cytotoxic type Cytolytic type	IgG IgM	Exogenous antigen (hapten) e.g. drug Cell- or matrix- associated antigen	Complement		Hemolytic anemia Thrombocytopenia Goodpasture syndrome
III Immune complex type	IgG IgM	Exogenous antigen e.g. drug, bacillus Autoantigen e.g. DNA	Complement Lysosomal enzyme	Delayed (h)	Serum sickness
IV Delayed type Cellular immunotype	Sensitized T lymphocytes	Exogenous antigen e.g. bacillus, drug Autoantigen	Cytokines	Delayed (days)	Contact dermatitis

HSR, hypersensitivity reactions.

attentive to the possibility of a reaction occurring well after the administration of the agent (38–41).

Incidence

Following the finding that immediate type hypersensitivity and asthma were occurring in workers at platinum refinement plants who repeatedly inhale platinum-containing dust (42), HSRs due to the use of anticancer agents have been reported since the 1970s (43). The incidence according to each agent is outlined in Table 2.

It is known that the HSR frequency increases with the number of carboplatin administrations (44,45). It has been reported that HSRs occur in 1% of cases in which carboplatin is administered for five or fewer cycles (45), but they occur in as many as 27% of cases in which more than seven cycles are administered (44). Additionally, it has been reported that HSRs occur in 44% of cases using second- and third-line therapies (46). In cases in which the clinician has a high probability of encountering HSRs, such as in ovarian cancer patients, it is expected that HSRs will be induced after retreatment with a carboplatin-containing regimen for relapses occurring after an interval of 6 or more months from the completion of primary therapies that incorporated carboplatin, hindering further treatment. Furthermore, HSRs have been reported in intraperitoneal administrations as well as transvenous administrations (47).

Similar to carboplatin, it is known that the HSR frequency increases with the number of cisplatin administrations (48,49); however, there are few reports of the frequency of HSRs, none of which are recent, with estimations ranging from 1 to 14% (50). Additionally, combination with radiation therapy increases the incidence of HSRs (51). Gralla et al. (49) reported no HSRs with up to five cycles of therapy, and yet, they reported that the incidence increased rapidly when the number of cycles reached six and above. However, there are few cases of more than six cycles of cisplatin being used for many types of cancer at present, and thus, HSRs may be encountered less frequently in cases of cisplatin administration.

When oxaliplatin was clinically adopted, the incidence of HSRs to this agent was found to be very low at 0.55% (52). However, reports of the HSR onset have increased with oxaliplatin use following the finding that oxaliplatin is effective as adjuvant chemotherapy for colon cancer as well as for unresectable or recurrent colon cancer, with a reported recent incidence of 10–25% (32,53–60). Although the majority of these were mild-to-moderate reactions, severe toxicity (Grade 3/4) cases occurred at a rate of ~1.6–7.3%, and thus, caution is warranted. The median number of administrations before the onset of an HSR is ~7–9, and similar to the other platinum agents, use of six or more cycles has been found to increase the HSR incidence. Kim et al.

(56) reported that the median time to the onset was 70 min from starting administration, and Polyzos et al. (32) reported that more severe HSRs occurred within 5–10 min from starting administration.

Risk factors

It is known that, in general, the incidence of HSRs to platinum agents increases as the number of administrations increases (21).

The reported risk factors for HSRs to carboplatin include age <70 years (61); a history of allergies to environmental stimuli or drugs (44,62); administration with carboplatin at 650 mg or more (63); and a long platinum-free interval (62–64). However, currently, studies have not consistently identified any risk factors.

Recently, Moon et al. (65) reported a mutation in the tumor suppressor gene BRCA1/2 as a risk factor for HSRs. According to their investigation, of 29 patients who either developed an HSR or had a history of HSRs, 27 had mutations in the BRCA gene, while of 31 patients with no mutations in the BRCA gene, only 2 patients developed HSRs. Consequently, it is possible that genetic mutations have some effect on the immune response.

Additionally, it has been reported that the combined use of liposomal doxorubicin and carboplatin is associated with a reduced HSR incidence rate when compared with combinations with paclitaxel (5.6 vs. 18.8%) and carboplatin alone (0 vs. 30%), which suggests the possibility that liposomes have some impact on immune cells. However, the underlying mechanism for this remains unclear (66,67).

Schwartz et al. (64) reported that the risk of a severe HSR to carboplatin was higher in the group in which the platinum-free interval was 2 years or more than in the group in which the interval was less than a year (47 vs. 6.5%), although these results require further verification.

Although there are a number of reports that have investigated the risk factors for the onset and severity of HSRs to oxaliplatin, as with carboplatin, a clear theory remains to be established (56–58,68,69). Kim et al. (56) suggested three risk factors for the onset of HSRs to oxaliplatin, including young age, female gender and use of oxaliplatin as a second-line or higher therapy. Female gender was also reported to be a risk factor for HSRs in a multivariate analysis by Parel et al. (60). Additionally, the total dose of oxaliplatin administered (57) and oxaliplatin-free interval (69) have been reported to be associated with HSRs, although further verification of these results is required.

Symptoms and treatment

The clinical manifestations of HSRs are both diverse and unpredictable. Cutaneous manifestations (pruritus, urticaria, facial flushing, angioedema, palmar erythema, erythematous rash), fever and/or shaking chills, gastrointestinal manifestations (abdominal pain, diarrhea, nausea), respiratory manifestations (dyspnea, bronchospasm) and circulatory manifestations (heart rate and blood pressure alterations) are generally found (13). However, cutaneous symptoms are found in 80–90% of patients with HSRs (25,70). Additionally, although most manifestations remain only mild to moderate, there are reports of manifestations escalating into severe and fatal manifestations (71).

The severity of symptoms is generally evaluated using the National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events v4.0 (Table 3).

Treatment of HSRs first involves early perception of changes in the patient's condition, and the administration of drugs is then ceased, and

Table 2. Incidence and severity of hypersensitivity to platinum drugs

Drug	Incidence (%)	Severe HSR incidence (%)	Median cycles of initial onset	Incidence (%)
Cisplatin	1–14	–	6	<5 cycles
			>6 cycles	24
Carboplatin	1–44	2	8	<6 cycles
			>7 cycles	27
Oxaliplatin	10–25	1.5–7	8	Front-line
			8	Second-line or higher

Table 3. National Cancer Institute—Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events v4.0 (CTCAE)

Adverse event	Grade				
	1	2	3	4	5
Allergic reaction	Transient flushing or rash, drug fever <38°C (<100.4°F); intervention not indicated	Intervention or infusion interruption indicated; responds promptly to symptomatic treatment (e.g. antihistamines, NSAIDs, narcotics); prophylactic medications indicated for ≤24 h	Prolonged (e.g. not rapidly responsive to symptomatic medication and/or brief interruption of infusion); recurrence of symptoms following initial improvement; hospitalization indicated for clinical sequelae (e.g. renal impairment, pulmonary infiltrates)	Life-threatening consequences; urgent intervention indicated	Death
Anaphylaxis	–	–	Symptomatic bronchospasm, with or without urticaria; parenteral intervention indicated; allergy-related edema/angioedema; hypotension	Life-threatening consequences; urgent intervention indicated	Death
Cytokine release syndrome	Mild reaction; infusion interruption not indicated; intervention not indicated	Therapy or infusion interruption indicated but responds promptly to symptomatic treatment (e.g. antihistamines, NSAIDs, narcotics, IV fluids); prophylactic medications indicated for ≤24 h	Prolonged (e.g. not rapidly responsive to symptomatic medication and/or brief interruption of infusion); recurrence of symptoms following initial improvement; hospitalization indicated for clinical sequelae (e.g. renal impairment, pulmonary infiltrates)	Life-threatening consequences; pressor or ventilatory support indicated	Death

NSAIDS, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs.

the infusion is then replaced with physiological saline. After a rapid evaluation of the patient's circulation, airway, breathing, state of consciousness and skin, oxygen is provided as required, and the venous administration of antihistamines and glucocorticoids or the rapid administration of epinephrine is provided for anaphylaxis or other severe cases (32). Antihistamines alleviate symptoms such as itching, urticaria and angioedema but have no life-saving effect (72). Glucocorticoids may also alleviate delayed reactions, but the therapeutic effects occur after some hours, and these drugs also have no life-saving effect (72). Epinephrine is used as the primary treatment, particularly for anaphylaxis, and an intramuscular injection of 0.1% (0.01 mg/kg) epinephrine (with a maximum of 0.5 mg for adults) is given immediately to the anterolateral side of the central thigh whenever there is a diagnosis or strong suspicion of anaphylaxis (73).

Although symptoms usually occur during or within a few hours of administration, the symptom onset can occur 1–2 days after administration in rare cases, and hence, it is critical to inform patients of this possibility (22). Additionally, extra attention should be paid to anaphylaxis cases in which biphasic anaphylaxis may occur several hours after cessation of treatment and resolution of symptoms (74).

The diagnosis of HSRs to platinum agents depends greatly on the patient's clinical course but is exceptionally difficult because of many confounding factors. First, patients receiving cancer therapy are prescribed many drugs that can cause HSRs. Second, it is possible that the cancer itself acts directly on mast cells to produce similar symptoms to those of an HSR. Third, several epidemiological studies have found that certain cancers have been shown to increase the risk of allergies (75). Because platinum agents are invaluable drugs in a number of cancers, and, unlike other drugs, they cannot be easily replaced, clinicians must evaluate the clinical course of

HSRs very carefully to analyze the possible link to platinum agent use. If possible, diagnosis may be made based on the results of skin or challenge testing (76).

When the clinician judges that an HSR to a platinum agent has occurred, but the prospect of altering the current treatment is unlikely because it has a firm basis and is effective, they must search for a treatment option that can be safely performed in cancer patients with allergy (75).

Desensitization

Since the report of desensitization to penicillin, the desensitization of various agents has been studied (77,78). Desensitization is the process in which the concentration of an anticancer drug acting as an antigen is increased in a slow and step-wise manner to induce a temporary tolerization state toward the drug, until the target dose is reached. It is also a useful approach for HSRs to platinum agents. No standardized protocol for desensitization has been established, and protocols differ by institution, with some even implementing it in outpatients (Table 4).

Although the mechanism of desensitization has not been fully understood, one hypothesis states that the internalization of antigen-specific IgE plays an important role (79–81). This has been tested through basic researches, and various *in vitro* and *in vivo* results have been reported (82,83). High-affinity IgE receptors on the surface of mast cells and basophils (FcεRI) act as key inducers of allergic reactions. When re-exposed to the causative agent, drug-specific IgEs bound to FcεRI bind to the drug and, through crosslinking of IgE, activate intracellular signaling to release chemical mediators such as histamine, leukotrienes, prostaglandins and cytokines in mast cells and

Table 4. Main desensitization protocols for platinum hypersensitivity

		Patients	Premedication-dose-route	Steps	Duration	Completion rate
Carboplatin	Confino-Cohen et al. (107)	20	Nothing Only antiemetics containing dexamethasone	From 1:1000 to 1:1 in four steps	6 h	95% of patients 99% of procedures
	Hesterberg et al. (89)	30	Fexofenadine 180 mg p.o. and/or desloratadine 5 mg p.o. Antiemetics containing dexamethasone 10 mg p.o.	Skin testing negative From 1:10 to 1:1 in eight steps Skin testing positive From 1:100 to 1:1 in 10 steps	6.35 and 11 h	97% of patients 99% of procedures
	Rose et al. (108)	33	Dexamethasone 20 mg p.o. or i.v. 6 h before Dexamethasone 20 mg i.v. and Diphenhydramine 50 mg i.v. 30 min before	From 1:1000 to 1:1 in four steps	16.5 h	79% of patients
	Lee et al. (87)	31	Diphenhydramine 25 mg i.v. Famotidine 20 mg i.v. or ranitidine 50 mg i.v. Lorazepam 1 mg (as needed for anxiety)	From 1:100 to 1:1 in 12 steps	5.8 h (inpatient) and 3.8 h (outpatient)	100% of patients and procedures 85% without symptoms
	Castells et al. (70)	60	Diphenhydramine or hydroxyzine 25 mg p.o. or i.v. Famotidine 20 mg i.v. or ranitidine 50 mg i.v. Lorazepam 0.5–1 mg p.o. or i.v. (as needed for anxiety)	From 1:100 to 1:1 in 12 steps	5.8 h	100% of patients and procedures 67% of procedures without symptoms
	Takase et al. (88)	20	Dexamethasone 24 mg i.v. ranitidine 50 mg i.v. Diphenhydramine 50 mg p.o.	From 1:1000 to 1:1 in four steps	4 h	80% of patients 95% of procedures 81% of procedures without symptoms
	Oxaliplatin	Lee et al. (92)	38	Chlorpheniramin 20 mg i.v. Hydrocortisone 100 mg i.v.	From 1:100 to 1:1 in 12 steps or from 1:10 000 to 1:1 5 steps	5.8 h or 8 h
	Cortijo-Cascajares et al. (91)	21	Corticosteroids: 1 mg/kg/day; Ranitidine: 300 mg/day; Cetirizine 20 mg/day; Montelukast: 10 mg/day the night before and 30 min before infusion	Total dose administered in an average of 14 steps	3–4 h	100% 89% of procedures without symptoms

i.v., intravenous; p.o., per orum.

basophils. These chemical mediators can induce vasodilation, bronchoconstriction and cardiac rate disturbances (84,85). In desensitization therapy, increasing doses of the antigen are administered at fixed intervals. Using this procedure in mouse bone marrow-derived mast cells sensitized to IgE specific to antigens such as dinitrophenyl and ovalbumin, the release of chemical mediators was suppressed (82). The production of cytokines related to delayed onset reactions, like IL-6, was also suppressed. This may explain why there are few reports of delayed onset reactions in desensitization (82).

The most comprehensive study of desensitization is that conducted by Castells et al. (70), which reported rapid desensitization in 98 patients to various drugs over 12 stages. Among these subjects, 65 patients had ovarian cancer, and 59 were desensitized to carboplatin. Three different concentrations of the solution were prepared and administered at four different infusion rates, with an administration time of 15 min for each step, except for the final step. As a result, among cases that underwent desensitization, HSRs occurred in 33% of cases. Nonetheless, it was reported that most of these were mild

reactions and less severe than initial HSRs, and HSRs occurred in 51% of cases during the final step. Regarding the treatment of these HSRs, one patient required epinephrine; however, all the cases completed the administration of carboplatin following recovery from their HSRs through appropriate medical treatment.

Furthermore, the same group reported alleviation of symptoms in 12 of 14 patients who had HSRs during desensitization, and these patients were prescribed 325 mg of acetylsalicylic acid, a prostaglandin blocker, and 10 mg of montelukast, a leukotriene blocker, both were administered 2 days prior to and on the day of desensitization. In 7 of these 12 patients, symptoms disappeared (86). Additionally, the group on acetylsalicylic acid and montelukast showed a significant reduction in symptoms compared with a historical control group using methylprednisolone as premedication (0.5 mg/kg intravenous).

Lee et al. (87) also conducted a 12-step rapid desensitization in 31 cases that had experienced moderate-to-severe HSRs to carboplatin. For safety, the first desensitization was performed in all the cases in an intensive care unit, followed by inpatient or outpatient care.

Administration to 13 outpatients of the 31 cases was made possible by reducing the amount of the solution and using a 3.8 h desensitization protocol. Although HSRs occurred in 15% of the desensitized cases, symptoms improved using, for example, antihistamines, and all cases succeeded in reaching the target dose.

There are only few comprehensive reports from Japan, although Takase et al. reported the use of a four-step, 4 h desensitization protocol in a group of 20 patients. They had a success rate of 80%, and its implementation was comparatively safe, with only a single case experiencing a Grade 3 adverse event (88). The protocol was very simple and rapid, and with the assistance of an allergist, we have conducted similar desensitizations in hospitalized patients at our institution.

Hesterberg et al. (89) modified the desensitization protocol according to the results of skin testing. Interestingly, on investigating the impact of the interval between the onset of initial HSRs and implementation of skin testing, they found that cases negative for the skin test within 3 months of the HSR did not experience HSRs during rapid desensitization. However, of eight patients who had undergone the skin test 9 months after initial HSRs, five showed resensitization during the initial rapid desensitization and tested positive before the second administration, and, even with long-term desensitization protocols, HSRs were found in four cases. By including this skin testing, they concluded that patients who had a long interval between the initial HSR and skin testing and who were converted from a negative to a positive result were at an increased risk of HSRs during the desensitization protocol. On investigating the reproducibility of the above results, 52% of patients who underwent skin testing converted from negative to positive results, and, in 92% of these 'converters,' 6 or more months had elapsed between their first HSR and skin testing (28). Additionally, the frequency of HSRs in the skin testing converter group was also increased, and they suggested that repeated skin testing was important in cases in which considerable time elapsed since their initial HSR.

O'Ceirbhail et al. conducted preventative desensitization over 3 h in 174 patients undergoing the administration of carboplatin for more than eight cycles. This desensitization involved premedication on the day prior to treatment, and on the day of treatment, 1% of the total infusion was administered over 1 h, and then, 9% of the infusion was administered over another hour, with the rest being administered over the third hour (90). Although this was a retrospective investigation, they reported that the 3 h desensitization group had a clear reduction in the incidence of HSRs when compared with the incidence of the group undergoing standard treatment (3.4 vs. 21%), and the median time until the onset of HSRs was increased (16 cycles vs. 9 cycles). Thus, it seems that these types of simple, preventative desensitizations are also worth considering.

There have been few investigations of desensitization to oxaliplatin; however, many of these have a small number of cases. Reports with 20 or more cases are shown in Table 4 (91,92).

Lee et al. (92) conducted a retrospective analysis of the results of 152 patients who had experienced HSRs to oxaliplatin and undergone a premedication protocol with 20 mg of chlorpheniramine and 100 mg of hydrocortisone given 1 h before administration and/or desensitization. The success rate of premedication alone in patients who had severe HSRs was only 22.7%, and this is difficult to endorse. However, the success rate reached 86% when desensitization was conducted, and it is recommended to perform desensitization from initial administration in patients who experienced severe HSRs. Even more interestingly, XELOX regimen with a 3 week interval was found to have a greater number of administrations before the onset of an initial HSR than FOLFOX regimen with a 2 week interval. However, the actual time from the start of treatment to the onset remained the same,

suggesting that rather than the number of administrations, the length of treatment may be important.

The approach for HSRs during desensitization is similar to the approach for HSRs in general; first, treatment is discontinued, and diphenhydramine or hydroxyzine is then administered. If a severe reaction develops, oxygen and inhaled bronchodilators may be given, and H₂-blockers and glucocorticoids are administered intravenously. When necessary, epinephrine may also be considered (70). After resolution of symptoms, while carefully verifying the safety, treatment may be restarted from where the desensitization process was interrupted, with a reduced infusion rate or a reduced increment of dose.

Discussion

The time within which HSRs are likely to occur in chemotherapy depends on the drugs used. Although they may occur on the first administration of taxanes, reactions to platinum agents often occur on readministration, and they are thus classified as the late onset (21). On rare occasions, HSRs represent very serious adverse events that can lead to death (93).

Although careful consideration should be given to strategies to respond to HSRs, routine premedication with antihistamines and steroids before starting treatment for HSRs to platinum agents is widely viewed in a negative light (53,94,95). Brandi et al. (53) reported that, even with premedication, five of six patients developed HSRs, and that simple premedication alone is not a sufficient approach. It is also worth considering switching to other platinum agents, and the efficacy of switching to nedaplatin has also been reported in Japan (96,97). However, this cannot be strongly recommended as methods of clinically investigating cross-reactivity between platinum agents are limited and it is difficult to predict safety; most studies have been small-scale and few have been prospective, and fatal cases have been reported (98,99). Skin testing may become false negative under the influence of glucocorticoids to use in an antiemetic drug purpose of chemotherapy and induced as irritation when used extravascularly. Other problems include the risk of inducing anaphylaxis even when used at a low dose and the excessive exposure of medical staff to anticancer drugs. Therefore, skin testing is by no means a requirement (100,101).

Although platinum agent cross-reactivity has been evaluated by means of skin testing and actual switching to other platinum agents, it is difficult to perform skin testing in clinical care settings for the reasons listed above; therefore, the frequency of cross-reactivity has not been clarified (17,30). Although we cannot yet be used in everyday clinical practice, the use of platin-specific IgE and basophil CD203c has been investigated to predict and diagnose HSRs to platinum agents (30,102). Although investigations involved only small groups of patients with HSRs to platinum agents in combination with skin testing in these patients, the sensitivity of carboplatin-specific IgE was 58.3% with a specificity of 100%, while both the sensitivity and specificity of oxaliplatin-specific IgE were 75% (30). Interestingly, 67% of patients with HSRs to oxaliplatin were also positive for carboplatin- and cisplatin-specific IgE despite not having been exposed to either of these. On the other hand, patients with HSRs to carboplatin but without oxaliplatin exposure had a positive rate of 0% for oxaliplatin-specific IgE. The authors stated that oxaliplatin was more immunogenic, and that readily changing to other platinum agents in patients who had HSRs to oxaliplatin should be avoided. CD203c is a specific surface marker on basophils and mast cells and is known to be immediately upregulated on stimulation by an antigen. In an investigation using the basophil surface marker CD203c, a sensitivity of ~55%

and a specificity of ~90% have been reported (103). Although it is too early to determine whether these results are sufficient for clinical use, further progress and development of these tests are anticipated in the future.

Desensitization involves the induction of a state of temporary tolerance by continuous exposure to an agent. However, if exposure to an agent is once lost, this tolerance is also lost. Consequently, the patient must undergo desensitization each time (104). Dependence on time and concentration desensitization appears to be key factors for successful desensitization (105). Although one approach for HSRs during desensitization involves reducing the infusion rate and using a low-gradient concentration change, this increases the infusion time. Such lengthy infusion times on each administration increases the time in which patients and medical staff are under stress, resulting in exhaustion. The search for an appropriate desensitization protocol should be conducted daily and necessitates high-quality, positive experimentation.

Nonetheless, a number of problems remain. HSRs are truly diverse, and patients with HSRs exhibit cutaneous, gastrointestinal, respiratory and circulatory symptoms, which make some cases difficult to diagnose. Additionally, a diagnosis of HSRs to platinum agents is based on clinical course and medical interviews to obtain information regarding any exposure and event up to the time of the onset. However, due to confounding factors such as the effects of advanced age and cranial irradiation on cognitive function and the effects of combination with other agents, there are cases in which it is difficult to make a diagnosis (75,106). Patil et al. (28) stated that, of 39 patients who were previously diagnosed as having HSRs to carboplatin based on the clinical course but were found to be negative in repeated skin testings, 11 (28%) had almost no HSRs during treatment conducted without any desensitization. In other words, it is possible that a certain proportion of patients have had their treatments changed or been desensitized after HSRs, or conditions mimicking HSRs have occurred from some unknown origin. It is therefore necessary to investigate diagnostic criteria using tools other than a patient's clinical course to extract patients with a true HSR to platinum agents.

Additionally, the standards for discontinuing and restarting desensitization following recovery via appropriate treatment of HSRs during desensitization and standards for the protocol for restarting treatment (the infusion rate and concentration) are both required (88). If these standards are entrusted to each clinician, it will likely cause large fluctuations in the completion rate that can be an endpoint of the desensitization protocol. Although Castells et al. (70) restarted treatment even in patients showing severe reactions during desensitization, it is generally appropriate to discontinue treatment for Grade 3 allergic reactions and anaphylaxis. Investigation of infusion times is also necessary. If the frequent of HSRs necessarily causes longer infusion times while using the rapid desensitization protocol, then this may weaken the significance of the rapidity and safety of such approaches.

Conclusion

When retreating after encountering an HSR, clinicians should act after thorough consideration of the risk of additional adverse events as well as of the efficacy of platinum agents in chemotherapy. Additionally, it is important to adequately explain the situation to patients who will undergo retreatment.

If conducted by medical teams, desensitization is a safe and effective method. The overall survival and quality of life of patients with HSRs to platinum agents can be improved through cooperative

medical practice by teams consisting of not only an oncologist but also an allergist and other experienced medical staff.

Conflict of interest statement

None declared.

References

- Rosenberg B, Vancamp L, Krigas T. Inhibition of cell division in *Escherichia coli* by electrolysis products from a platinum electrode. *Nature* 1965;205:698–9.
- Park JO, Kim SW, Ahn JS, Suh C, Lee JS, Jang JS, et al. Phase III trial of two versus four additional cycles in patients who are nonprogressive after two cycles of platinum-based chemotherapy in non small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:5233–9.
- Smith IE, O'Brien ME, Talbot DC, Nicolson MC, Mansi JL, Hickish TF, et al. Duration of chemotherapy in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: a randomized trial of three versus six courses of mitomycin, vinblastine, and cisplatin. *J Clin Oncol* 2001;19:1336–43.
- Koizumi W, Narahara H, Hara T, Takagane A, Akiya T, Takagi M, et al. S-1 plus cisplatin versus S-1 alone for first-line treatment of advanced gastric cancer (SPIRITS trial): a phase III trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2008;9:215–21.
- Boku N, Yamamoto S, Fukuda H, Shirao K, Doi T, Sawaki A, et al. Fluorouracil versus combination of irinotecan plus cisplatin versus S-1 in metastatic gastric cancer: a randomised phase 3 study. *Lancet Oncol* 2009;10:1063–69.
- Parmar MK, Ledermann JA, Colombo N, du Bois A, Delaloye JF, Kristensen GB, et al. Paclitaxel plus platinum-based chemotherapy versus conventional platinum-based chemotherapy in women with relapsed ovarian cancer: the ICON4/AGO-OVAR-2.2 trial. *Lancet* 2003;361:2099–106.
- Pfisterer J, Vergote I, Du Bois A, Eisenhauer E; AGO-OVAR; NCIC CTG, et al. Combination therapy with gemcitabine and carboplatin in recurrent ovarian cancer. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2005;15:36–41.
- André T, Boni C, Navarro M, Taberero J, Hickish T, Topham C, et al. Improved overall survival with oxaliplatin, fluorouracil, and leucovorin as adjuvant treatment in stage II or III colon cancer in the MOSAIC trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27:3109–16.
- Allegra CJ, Yothers G, O'Connell MJ, Sharif S, Petrelli NJ, Colangelo LH, et al. Phase III trial assessing bevacizumab in stages II and III carcinoma of the colon: results of NSABP protocol C-08. *J Clin Oncol* 2011;29:11–6.
- de Gramont A, Figuer A, Seymour M, Homerin M, Hmissi A, Cassidy J, et al. Leucovorin and fluorouracil with or without oxaliplatin as first-line treatment in advanced colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2000;18:2938–47.
- Rothenberg ML, Oza AM, Bigelow RH, Berlin JD, Marshall JL, Ramanathan RK, et al. Superiority of oxaliplatin and fluorouracil–leucovorin compared with either therapy alone in patients with progressive colorectal cancer after irinotecan and fluorouracil–leucovorin: interim results of a phase III trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:2059–69.
- Conroy T, Desseigne F, Ychou M, Bouché O, Guimbaud R, Bécouarn Y, et al. FOLFIRINOX versus gemcitabine for metastatic pancreatic cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2011;364:1817–25.
- Shepherd GM. Hypersensitivity reactions to chemotherapeutic drugs. *Clin Rev Allergy Immunol* 2003;24:253–62.
- Makrilia N, Syrigou E, Kaklamanos I, Manolopoulos L, Saif MW. Hypersensitivity reactions associated with platinum antineoplastic agents: a systematic review. *Met Based Drugs* 2010;2010:207084.
- Maindault-Goebel F, André T, Tournigand C, Louvet C, Perez-Staub N, Zeghib N, et al. Allergic-type reactions to oxaliplatin: retrospective analysis of 42 patients. *Eur J Cancer* 2005;41:2262–67.
- Kidera Y, Satoh T, Ueda S, Okamoto W, Okamoto I, Fumita S, et al. High-dose dexamethasone plus antihistamine prevents colorectal cancer patients treated with modified FOLFOX6 from hypersensitivity reactions induced by oxaliplatin. *Int J Clin Oncol* 2011;16:244–9.

17. Callahan MB, Lachance JA, Stone RL, Kelsey J, Rice LW, Jazaeri AA. Use of cisplatin without desensitization after carboplatin hypersensitivity reaction in epithelial ovarian and primary peritoneal cancer. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2007;197:199.
18. Kandel MJ, Loehr A, Harter P, Traut A, Gnauert K, du Bois A. Cisplatin rechallenge in relapsed ovarian cancer patients with platinum reinduction therapy and carboplatin hypersensitivity. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2005;15:780–4.
19. Pagani M, Bonadonna P, Senna GE, Antico A. Standardization of skin tests for diagnosis and prevention of hypersensitivity reactions to oxaliplatin. *Int Arch Allergy Immunol* 2008;145:54–7.
20. Castells M. Rapid desensitization for hypersensitivity reactions to chemotherapy agents. *Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol* 2006;6:271–7.
21. Lenz HJ. Management and preparedness for infusion and hypersensitivity reactions. *Oncologist* 2007;12:601–9.
22. Zanotti KM, Markman M. Prevention and management of antineoplastic-induced hypersensitivity reactions. *Drug Saf* 2001;24:767–79.
23. Dillman RO, Hendrix CS. Unique aspects of supportive care using monoclonal antibodies in cancer treatment. *Support Cancer Ther* 2003;1:38–48.
24. Caiado J, Picard M. Diagnostic tools for hypersensitivity to platinum drugs and taxanes: skin testing, specific IgE, and mast cell/basophil mediators. *Curr Allergy Asthma Rep* 2014;14:451.
25. Simons FE, Arduzzo LR, Bilò MB, El-Gamal YM, Ledford DK, Ring J, et al. World allergy organization guidelines for the assessment and management of anaphylaxis. *World Allergy Organ J* 2011;4:13–37.
26. Markman M, Zanotti K, Peterson G, Kulp B, Webster K, Belinson J. Expanded experience with an intradermal skin test to predict for the presence or absence of carboplatin hypersensitivity. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:4611–4.
27. Zanotti KM, Rybicki LA, Kennedy AW, Belinson JL, Webster KD, Kulp B, et al. Carboplatin skin testing: a skin-testing protocol for predicting hypersensitivity to carboplatin chemotherapy. *J Clin Oncol* 2001;19:3126–9.
28. Patil SU, Long AA, Ling M, Wilson MT, Hesterberg P, Wong JT, et al. A protocol for risk stratification of patients with carboplatin-induced hypersensitivity reactions. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2012;129:443–7.
29. Gomez R, Harter P, Lück HJ, Traut A, Kommos S, Kandel M, et al. Carboplatin hypersensitivity: does introduction of skin test and desensitization reliably predict and avoid the problem? A prospective single-center study. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2009;19:1284–7.
30. Caiado J, Venemalm L, Pereira-Santos MC, Costa L, Barbosa MP, Castells M. Carboplatin-, oxaliplatin-, and cisplatin-specific IgE: cross-reactivity and value in the diagnosis of carboplatin and oxaliplatin allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2013;1:494–500.
31. Garufi C, Vaglio S, Brienza S, Conti L, D'Attino RM, Girelli G, et al. Immuno-hemolytic anemia following oxaliplatin administration. *Ann Oncol* 2000;11:497.
32. Polyzos A, Tsavaris N, Gogas H, Souglakos J, Vambakas L, Vardakas N, et al. Clinical features of hypersensitivity reactions to oxaliplatin: a 10-year experience. *Oncology* 2009;76:36–41.
33. Getaz EP, Beckley S, Fitzpatrick J, Dozier A. Cisplatin-induced hemolysis. *N Engl J Med* 1980;302:334–5.
34. Marani TM, Trich MB, Armstrong KS, Ness PM, Smith J, Minniti C, et al. Carboplatin-induced immune hemolytic anemia. *Transfusion* 1996;36:1016–8.
35. Santini D, Tonini G, Salerno A, Vincenzi B, Patti G, BBrandiattistoni F, et al. Idiosyncratic reaction after oxaliplatin infusion. *Ann Oncol* 2001;12:132–3.
36. Tonini G, Santini D, Vincenzi B, Borzomati D, Dicuonzo G, La Cesa A, et al. Oxaliplatin may induce cytokine-release syndrome in colorectal cancer patients. *J Biol Regul Homeost Agents* 2002;16:105–9.
37. Ulrich-Pur H, Penz M, Fiebiger WC, Schüll B, Kornek GV, Scheithauer W, et al. Oxaliplatin-induced fever and release of IL-6. *Oncology* 2000;59:187–9.
38. de Vries RS, Mattijssen EJ, van Sorge AA. Serious delayed hypersensitivity reaction to oxaliplatin. *Ann Oncol* 2006;17:1723–4.
39. Masse MS, Caimmi D, Demoly P. A delayed reaction to oxaliplatin. *J Invest Allergol Clin Immunol* 2012;22:372–3.
40. Leguy-Seguin V, Jolimoy G, Coudert B, Pernot C, Dalac S, Vabres P, et al. Diagnostic and predictive value of skin testing in platinum salt hypersensitivity. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2007;119:726–30.
41. Ichikawa Y, Goto A, Hirokawa S, Kijima M, Ishikawa T, Chishima T, et al. Allergic reactions to oxaliplatin in a single institute in Japan. *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2009;39:616–20.
42. Cleare MJ, Hughes EG, Jacoby B, Pepys J. Immediate (type I) allergic responses to platinum compounds. *Clin Allergy* 1976;6:183–95.
43. Williams CJ, Whitehouse JM. Cis-platinum: a new anticancer agent. *Br Med J* 1979;1:1689–91.
44. Markman M, Kennedy A, Webster K, Elson P, Peterson G, Kulp B, et al. Clinical features of hypersensitivity reactions to carboplatin. *J Clin Oncol* 1999;17:1141–5.
45. Sliesoraitis S, Chikhale PJ. Carboplatin hypersensitivity. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2005;15:13–8.
46. Morgan JS, Adams M, Mason MD. Hypersensitivity reactions to carboplatin given to patients with relapsed ovarian carcinoma. *Eur J Cancer* 1994;30A:1205–6.
47. Shukunami K, Kurokawa T, Kawakami Y, Kubo M, Kotsuji F. Hypersensitivity reactions to intraperitoneal administration of carboplatin in ovarian cancer: the first report of a case. *Gynecol Oncol* 1999;72:431–2.
48. Robinson JB, Singh D, Bodurka-Bevers DC, Wharton JT, Gershenson DM, Wolf JK. Hypersensitivity reactions and the utility of oral and intravenous desensitization in patients with gynecologic malignancies. *Gynecol Oncol* 2001;82:550–8.
49. Gralla RJ, Casper ES, Kelsen DP, Braun DW Jr, Dukeman ME, Martini N, et al. Cisplatin and vindesine combination chemotherapy for advanced carcinoma of the lung: a randomized trial investigating two dosage schedules. *Ann Intern Med* 1981;95:414–20.
50. Cheng E, Cvitkovic E, Wittes RE, Golbey RB. Germ cell tumors (II): VAB II in metastatic testicular cancer. *Cancer* 1978;42:2162–8.
51. Koren C, Yerushalmi R, Katz A, Malik H, Sulkes A, Fenig E. Hypersensitivity reaction to cisplatin during chemoradiation therapy for gynecologic malignancy. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2002;25:625–6.
52. Thomas RR, Quinn MG, Schuler B, Grem JL. Hypersensitivity and idiosyncratic reactions to oxaliplatin. *Cancer* 2003;97:2301–7.
53. Brandi G, Pantaleo MA, Galli C, Falcone A, Antonuzzo A, Mordenti P, et al. Hypersensitivity reactions related to oxaliplatin (OHP). *Br J Cancer* 2003;89:477–81.
54. André T, Boni C, Mounedji-Boudiaf L, Navarro M, Tabernero J, Hickish T, et al. Oxaliplatin, fluorouracil, and leucovorin as adjuvant treatment for colon cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350:2343–51.
55. Siu SW, Chan RT, Au GK. Hypersensitivity reactions to oxaliplatin: experience in a single institute. *Ann Oncol* 2006;17:259–61.
56. Kim BH, Bradley T, Tai J, Budman DR. Hypersensitivity to oxaliplatin: an investigation of incidence and risk factors, and literature review. *Oncology* 2009;76:231–8.
57. Shao YY, Hu FC, Liang JT, Chiu WT, Cheng AL, Yang CH. Characteristics and risk factors of oxaliplatin-related hypersensitivity reactions. *J Formos Med Assoc* 2010;109:362–8.
58. Kim MY, Kang SY, Lee SY, Yang MS, Kim MH, Song WJ, et al. Hypersensitivity reactions to oxaliplatin: clinical features and risk factors in Koreans. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2012;13:1209–15.
59. Seki K, Senzaki K, Tsuduki Y, Ioroi T, Fujii M, Yamauchi H, et al. Risk factors for oxaliplatin-induced hypersensitivity reactions in Japanese patients with advanced colorectal cancer. *Int J Med Sci* 2011;8:210–5.
60. Parel M, Ranchon F, Nosbaum A, You B, Vantard N, Schwierz V, et al. Hypersensitivity to oxaliplatin: clinical features and risk factors. *BMC Pharmacol Toxicol* 2014;15:1.
61. Joly F, Ray-Coquard I, Fabbro M, Donoghoe M, Boman K, Sugimoto A, et al. Decreased hypersensitivity reactions with carboplatin-pegylated liposomal doxorubicin compared to carboplatin-paclitaxel combination: analysis from the GCIG CALYPSO relapsing ovarian cancer trial. *Gynecol Oncol* 2011;122:226–32.

62. Gadducci A, Tana R, Teti G, Zanca G, Fanucchi A, Genazzani AR. Analysis of the pattern of hypersensitivity reactions in patients receiving carboplatin retreatment for recurrent ovarian cancer. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2008;18:615–20.
63. Sugimoto H, Iwamoto T, Murashima Y, Tabata T, Sagawa N, Okuda M. Risk factors contributing to the development of carboplatin-related delayed hypersensitivity reactions in Japanese patients with gynecologic cancers. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 2011;67:415–19.
64. Schwartz JR, Bandera C, Bradley A, Brard L, Legare R, Granai CO, et al. Does the platinum-free interval predict the incidence or severity of hypersensitivity reactions to carboplatin? The experience from Women and Infants' Hospital. *Gynecol Oncol* 2007;105:81–3.
65. Moon DH, Lee JM, Noonan AM, Annunziata CM, Minasian L, Houston N, et al. Deleterious BRCA1/2 mutation is an independent risk factor for carboplatin hypersensitivity reactions. *Br J Cancer* 2013;109:1072–78.
66. Pujade-Lauraine E, Wagner U, Aavall-Lundqvist E, GebSKI V, Heywood M, Vasey PA, et al. Pegylated liposomal doxorubicin and carboplatin compared with paclitaxel and carboplatin for patients with platinum-sensitive ovarian cancer in late relapse. *J Clin Oncol* 2010;28:3323–9.
67. Markman M, Moon J, Wilczynski S, Lopez AM, Rowland KM Jr, Michelin DP, et al. Single agent carboplatin versus carboplatin plus pegylated liposomal doxorubicin in recurrent ovarian cancer: final survival results of a SWOG (S0200) phase 3 randomized trial. *Gynecol Oncol* 2010;116:323–5.
68. Shibata Y, Ariyama H, Baba E, Takii Y, Esaki T, Mitsugi K, et al. Oxaliplatin-induced allergic reaction in patients with colorectal cancer in Japan. *Int J Clin Oncol* 2009;14:397–401.
69. Mori Y, Nishimura T, Kitano T, Yoshimura K, Matsumoto S, Kanai M, et al. Oxaliplatin-free interval as a risk factor for hypersensitivity reaction among colorectal cancer patients treated with FOLFOX. *Oncology* 2010;79:136–43.
70. Castells MC, Tennant NM, Sloane DE, Hsu FI, Barrett NA, Hong DI, et al. Hypersensitivity reactions to chemotherapy: outcomes and safety of rapid desensitization in 413 cases. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2008;30:1160–5.
71. Wang JH, King TM, Chang MC, Hsu CW. Oxaliplatin-induced severe anaphylactic reactions in metastatic colorectal cancer: case series analysis. *World J Gastroenterol* 2012;18:5427–33.
72. Gaeta TJ, Clark S, Pelletier AJ, Camargo CA. National study of US emergency department visits for acute allergic reactions, 1993 to 2004. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 2007;98:360–5.
73. Lieberman P, Nicklas RA, Oppenheimer J, Kemp SF, Lang DM, Bernstein DI, et al. The diagnosis and management of anaphylaxis practice parameter: 2010 update. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2010;126:477–80.
74. Confino-Cohen R, Goldberg A. Allergen immunotherapy-induced biphasic systemic reactions: incidence, characteristics, and outcome: a prospective study. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 2010;104:73–8.
75. Pagani M. The complex clinical picture of presumably allergic side effects to cytostatic drugs: symptoms, pathomechanism, reexposure, and desensitization. *Med Clin North Am* 2010;94:835–52.
76. Demoly P, Bousquet J. Drug allergy diagnosis work up. *Allergy* 2002;57:37–40.
77. Wendel GD Jr, Stark BJ, Jamison RB, Molina RD, Sullivan TJ. Penicillin allergy and desensitization in serious infections during pregnancy. *N Engl J Med* 1985;312:1229–32.
78. Sullivan TJ. Antigen-specific desensitization of patients allergic to penicillin. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1982;69:500–8.
79. Shalit M, Pickholz D, Levi-Schaffer F. Mast cells retain their responsiveness upon continuous and repetitive exposure to antigen. *Immunology* 1993;79:319–24.
80. MacGlashan D Jr. Subthreshold desensitization of human basophils re-capitulates the loss of Syk and FcεRI expression characterized by other methods of desensitization. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2012;42:1060–70.
81. Shalit M, Levi-Schaffer F. Challenge of mast cells with increasing amounts of antigen induces desensitization. *Clin Exp Allergy* 1995;25:896–902.
82. Sancho-Serra Mdel C, Simarro M, Castells M. Rapid IgE desensitization is antigen specific and impairs early and late mast cell responses targeting FcεRI internalization. *Eur J Immunol* 2011;41:1004–13.
83. Oka T, Rios EJ, Tsai M, Kalesnikoff J, Galli SJ. Rapid desensitization induces internalization of antigen-specific IgE on mouse mast cells. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2013;132:922–32.
84. Metcalfe DD, Baram D, Mekori YA. Mast cells. *Physiol Rev* 1997;77:1033–79.
85. Galli SJ, Tsai M. IgE and mast cells in allergic disease. *Nat Med* 2012;18:693–704.
86. Breslow RG, Caiado J, Castells MC. Acetylsalicylic acid and montelukast block mast cell mediator-related symptoms during rapid desensitization. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 2009;102:155–60.
87. Lee CW, Matulonis UA, Castells MC. Rapid inpatient/outpatient desensitization for chemotherapy hypersensitivity: standard protocol effective in 57 patients for 255 courses. *Gynecol Oncol* 2005;99:393–9.
88. Takase N, Matsumoto K, Onoe T, Kitao A, Tanioka M, Kikukawa Y, et al. 4-step 4-h carboplatin desensitization protocol for patients with gynecological malignancies showing platinum hypersensitivity: a retrospective study. *Int J Clin Oncol* 2014 (epub ahead of print).
89. Hesterberg PE, Banerji A, Oren E, Penson RT, Krasner CN, Seiden MV, et al. Risk stratification for desensitization of patients with carboplatin hypersensitivity: clinical presentation and management. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2009;123:1262–7.
90. O'Ceirbhail R, Zhou Q, Iasonos A, Hensley ML, Tew WP, Aghajanian C, et al. The prophylactic conversion to an extended infusion schedule and use of premedication to prevent hypersensitivity reactions in ovarian cancer patients during carboplatin retreatment. *Gynecol Oncol* 2010;116:326–31.
91. Cortijo-Cascajares S, Nacle-López I, García-Escobar I, Aguilera-Vizcaíno MJ, Herreros-de-Tejada A, Cortés-Funes Castro H, et al. Effectiveness of oxaliplatin desensitization protocols. *Clin Transl Oncol* 2013;15:219–25.
92. Lee SY, Kang HR, Song WJ, Lee KH, Han SW, Cho SH. Overcoming oxaliplatin hypersensitivity: different strategies are needed according to the severity and previous exposure. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 2014;73:1021–29.
93. Boulanger J, Boursiquot JN, Cournoyer G, Lemieux J, Masse MS, Almanic K, et al. Management of hypersensitivity to platinum- and taxane-based chemotherapy: cepto review and clinical recommendations. *Curr Oncol* 2014;21:630–41.
94. Syrighou E, Triantafyllou O, Makrilia N, Kaklamanos I, Kotanidou A, Manolopoulos L, et al. Acute hypersensitivity reactions to chemotherapy agents: an overview. *Inflamm Allergy Drug Targets* 2010;9:206–13.
95. Polyzos A, Tsavaris N, Kosmas C, Arnaouti T, Kalahanis N, Tsigris C, et al. Hypersensitivity reactions to carboplatin administration are common but not always severe: a 10-year experience. *Oncology* 2001;61:129–33.
96. Arimoto T, Oda K, Nakagawa S, Kawana K, Tsukazaki T, Adachi K, et al. Retreatment with nedaplatin in patients with recurrent gynecological cancer after the development of hypersensitivity reaction to carboplatin. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res* 2013;39:336–40.
97. Michikami H, Minaguchi T, Ochi H, Onuki M, Okada S, Matsumoto K, et al. Safety and efficacy of substituting nedaplatin after carboplatin hypersensitivity reactions in gynecologic malignancies. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res* 2013;39:330–5.
98. Zweigig S, Roman LD, Mudderspach LI. Death from anaphylaxis to cisplatin: a case report. *Gynecol Oncol* 1994;53:121–2.
99. Dizon DS, Sabbatini PJ, Aghajanian C, Hensley ML, Spriggs DR. Analysis of patients with epithelial ovarian cancer or fallopian tube carcinoma retreated with cisplatin after the development of a carboplatin allergy. *Gynecol Oncol* 2002;84:378–82.

100. Brockow K, Romano A. Skin tests in the diagnosis of drug hypersensitivity reactions. *Curr Pharm Des* 2008;14:2778–91.
101. Vyas N, Yiannakis D, Turner A, Sewell GJ. Occupational exposure to anti-cancer drugs: a review of effects of new technology. *J Oncol Pharm Pract* 2013;20:278–87.
102. Madrigal-Burgaleta R, Berges-Gimeno MP, Angel-Pereira D, Ferreiro-Monteagudo R, Guillen-Ponce C, Pueyo C, et al. Hypersensitivity and desensitization to antineoplastic agents: outcomes of 189 procedures with a new short protocol and novel diagnostic tools assessment. *Allergy* 2013;68:853–61.
103. Iwamoto T, Yuta A, Tabata T, Sugimoto H, Gabazza EC, Hirai H, et al. Evaluation of basophil CD203c as a predictor of carboplatin-related hypersensitivity reaction in patients with gynecologic cancer. *Biol Pharm Bull* 2012;35:1487–95.
104. Liu A, Fanning L, Chong H, Fernandez J, Sloane D, Sancho-Serra M, et al. Desensitization regimens for drug allergy: state of the art in the 21st century. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2011;41:1679–89.
105. Morales AR, Shah N, Castells M. Antigen-IgE desensitization in signal transducer and activator of transcription 6-deficient mast cells by sub-optimal doses of antigen. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 2005;94:575–80.
106. Simons FE. Anaphylaxis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2010;125:S161–81.
107. Confino-Cohen R, Fishman A, Altaras M, Goldberg A. Successful carboplatin desensitization in patients with proven carboplatin allergy. *Cancer* 2005;104:640–3.
108. Rose PG, Fusco N, Smrekar M, Mossbrugger K, Rodriguez M. Successful administration of carboplatin in patients with clinically documented carboplatin hypersensitivity. *Gynecol Oncol* 2003;89:429–33.