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Abstract

Background: Chronic spontaneous urticaria (CSU) is a condition characterised by the presence of hives with/without angioedema, that affects individuals on more days than not for 6 weeks or more. The role of infection as a potential trigger for CSU is well described, but the current clinical guidelines do not recommend routine screening for underlying infections.

Main observations: We report a case of severe prolonged chronic spontaneous urticaria in a 19-year-old, that went into rapid remission following the treatment of dental infection.

Conclusions: Clinicians should recognise the potential role that infection can have in causing chronic urticaria. There should be a low threshold to treat infection in such circumstances.
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Discussion

Chronic spontaneous urticaria (CSU) is defined as daily or almost daily urticaria for at least 6 weeks. In up to 50% of patients, urticaria may be associated with episodes of angioedema. These features are the result of degranulation of mast cells with the release of granule contents, predominantly histamine. Patients often present to their GP and are referred for further assessment and management by Immunologists, Allergists or Dermatologists when first line treatment with antihistamines fail to control the symptoms. The mainstay of treatment is high dose antihistamines and leukotriene receptor antagonists. In recent years, the anti-IgE monoclonal antibody therapy, Omalizumab, has been used as an effective treatment for patients who fail to respond to first line therapy.

In cases of CSU, triggers such as food-based allergens or airborne allergens are rarely implicated. In acute urticaria (defined as having a duration of less than 6 weeks), causes are more likely to be identified. In one study of 79 cases of acute urticaria, 36.7% were secondary to infection. A number of studies have demonstrated an increased prevalence of oropharyngeal infections including dental infections, sinusitis and tonsillitis in patients with chronic urticaria. An early study from 1964 demonstrated radiological evidence of focal dental infection in 29% of their cohort of patients with chronic urticaria. In addition, cases have been reported of resolution of urticaria after treatment of dental infections. In one case bacterial cultures from dental lesions grew the gram-negative bacteria Veillonella parvula. It is thought that Lipopolysaccharide from gram negative bacteria induces an inflammatory response characterised by histamine release from mast cells and resulting urticaria.

The presented case history demonstrates the close temporal relationship between treatment of dental infection and the improvement of urticaria and reduction in medication requirements. Inflammatory markers were not monitored in this case but may have been elevated. Measurement of markers of the acute inflammatory response, including CRP, can easily be included in assessment of patients with chronic urticaria. Together with a careful history, an elevation in acute inflammatory markers, may highlight the presence of infection/inflammation. Where infection has been excluded, the elevated inflammatory markers may identify patients with more severe chronic urticaria.

Our patient had failed first and second line treatments for chronic urticaria with persistent and troublesome symptoms. With a UAS 7 >28, demonstrating poorly controlled chronic urticaria, he was eligible to commence anti-IgE therapy. Monoclonal antibody anti-IgE treatment with Omalizumab is now provided by some immunology and dermatology units in the UK. Patients are given Omalizumab by sub-cutaneous injection once a month for 6 months, and their response is monitored throughout. Although relatively safe, any new treatment is not without the risk of side effects. In addition, the treatment is costly, and should be reserved for patients who have severe CSU that fail to respond to treatment with the maximum dose of anti-histamine treatment and leukotriene receptor antagonists.

Our case history illustrates the importance of searching for infections, including odontogenic infections, prior to commencing immunosuppression or anti-IgE therapy in patients who are resistant to first line treatment of CSU.
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This case report describes a patient who developed CSU refractory to 1st and 2nd line therapies. His CSU resolved promptly after treatment of the concurrent dental infection.

This case illustrates importance of searching for underlying causes of CSU as part of routine clinical assessment. The authors state that routine infection screen is not recommended by the current guidelines, however the guidelines state: “The diagnosis is based primarily on the clinical history. Investigations are determined by the clinical history and presentation, but may not be necessary”. Although infection screen is not specifically mentioned, taking a thorough clinical history as suggested by the guidelines should include enquiry about possible infections and subsequent investigations might include an infection screen.

One of the reasons why infections might be overlooked when assessing CSU, is that the past recommendations for routine screening for H. Pylori and its eradication failed to produce desired outcomes1. There are other examples in the literature where chronic infection has been linked with CSU, and one such example is HepC and HepB. However, a comprehensive review of the literature failed to find an obvious associations, and routine screening is not recommended2.

In summary, this is well written article with a useful message, but discussion regarding the role of infection triggers in CSU should be more comprehensive and include the points mentioned above.
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