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ABSTRACT Bronchial responsiveness (histamine PC20) and peripheral blood eosinophil counts were measured in 23 asthmatic subjects, of whom 14 were atopic and nine non-atopic. In the group as a whole there was an inverse correlation between baseline eosinophil count and histamine PC20 (r = -0.71; p < 0.001). For atopic subjects a relationship between eosinophil count and histamine PC20 was observed (r = -0.74; p < 0.01), but there was no correlation between eosinophil count and baseline FEV1 or baseline FEV1 and histamine PC20. For the non-atopic subjects a similar relationship between eosinophil count and histamine PC20 was seen (r = -0.68; p < 0.05) and a less significant inverse correlation between baseline eosinophil count and baseline FEV1 (r = -0.65; p < 0.05). These results show a relationship between eosinophil count and non-specific bronchial responsiveness in both atopic and non-atopic asthma.

Eosinophilia in association with reversible airways obstruction has been recognised since the early 1900s but the precise role of the eosinophil has not been fully established. It appears to have the potential for a dual role, on the one hand releasing enzymes capable of degrading mast cell mediators and modulating their effects but on the other contributing to tissue damage by deposition of major basic protein in the bronchi. In patients with stable asthma the peripheral blood eosinophil count shows wide variation and eosinophilia does not differentiate atopic from non-atopic asthma. In non-atopic asthma a relationship between the peripheral blood eosinophil count and the FEV1 has been observed and the eosinophil count shown to be useful in monitoring disease activity. In addition, a relationship between eosinophil count and methacholine PC20 has been observed in subjects with allergen induced late phase asthmatic reactions.

We have investigated the relationship between the peripheral blood eosinophil count and bronchial responsiveness determined by histamine challenge in subjects with atopic and non-atopic asthma.
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Methods

Patients
Twenty three asthmatic patients who were not taking systemic steroids were studied. The 14 atopic patients (six male, eight female) had a mean age of 33 (range 16–74) years. The nine non-atopic patients (three male, six female) had a mean age of 44 (range 35–58) years. All patients gave their informed consent before the study, which was approved by the local ethical committee. The diagnosis of asthma was based on a history of episodic dyspnoea and recorded variability in FEV1 of more than 20%. The atopic subjects were defined as having positive skin prick test responses to at least one common allergen and a history of asthma or hay fever in first degree relatives. The non-atopic group had negative skin test responses and no such family history. Inclusion in the study required that they were relatively symptom free but having treatment and had not experienced intercurrent respiratory tract infection during the preceding month.

The group contained three current smokers and one ex-smoker; the rest were lifelong non-smokers (table). Altogether five subjects were inhaling sodium cromoglycate, eight corticosteroid, and one both drugs (table). All subjects inhaled β agonists when they had symptoms and one subject was taking oral theophylline.

Histamine Challenge Test
Patients continued their usual medication but with-
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Data on the subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age (y)</th>
<th>FEV\textsubscript{1} % pred</th>
<th>Eosinophil count ((\times 10^6)/l)</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>PC\textsubscript{20} (mg/ml)</th>
<th>Smoking history</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATOPIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>C, B</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>B, C, S, B</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>B, C, T</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>S, B</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>C, B</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>S, B</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>S, B</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>C, B</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-ATOPIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>C, B</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>S, B</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>S, B</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>S, B</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>S, B</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>S, B</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B—inhaled \(\beta\) agonist; C—inhaled sodium cromoglycate; S—inhaled corticosteroid; T—oral theophylline; PC\textsubscript{20}—histamine concentration causing 20% fall in FEV\textsubscript{1}; C—current smoker; E—ex-smoker; N—lifelong non-smoker.

held inhaled \(\beta\) agonists for 12 hours and oral theophylline for 48 hours before testing. The method of Cockcroft\textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{6} was employed except that Acorn nebulisers were used. After baseline spirometry, aerosols of test solutions were generated by passing oxygen through the nebulisers at a flow rate of 6 l/min\textsuperscript{−1}. The same nebulisers were used for given concentrations of histamine throughout, their outputs having previously been calibrated. Aerosols were inhaled by tidal breathing for two minutes. First phosphate buffered saline was inhaled, followed at five minute intervals by doubling concentrations of histamine acid phosphate, starting at 0.03 mg/ml. The Vitalograph dry bellows spirometer was used for measurements of FEV\textsubscript{1} and predicted values were obtained.\textsuperscript{7} The FEV\textsubscript{1} was measured at 30 and 90 seconds after each inhalation; the lower of the two values was used and the test was discontinued when the FEV\textsubscript{1} had fallen by more than 20% of the value obtained after inhalation of phosphate buffered saline. The concentration of histamine required to cause a 20% fall in the FEV\textsubscript{1} (PC\textsubscript{20}) was obtained from the log dose-response curve. All tests were performed between 10.00 and 12.00 hours.

Eosinophil counts

Venous blood was taken just before histamine challenge testing and put into a tube containing EDTA. Eosinophil counts were performed with a Fuchs-Rosenthal counting chamber.\textsuperscript{8} The EDTA blood was added to diluting fluid containing 10 ml aqueous eosin (200 g/l), 10 ml acetone, and 80 ml distilled water to obtain a 1:20 dilution. The suspension was mixed for 30 seconds and added to the counting chamber. The total number of eosinophils within the ruled area was counted and at least four chambers were counted. The results were expressed as total eosinophils per litre. Counts were performed by one observer without knowledge of the patient's histamine PC\textsubscript{20}. The coefficient of variation for eosinophil counts obtained by this method was consistently less than 10%.

\textbf{Statistical methods}

Natural logarithmic transformations were applied to all histamine PC\textsubscript{20} values before analysis. Correlation coefficients were calculated by use of linear regression analysis by the method of least squares.

\textbf{Results}

Individual eosinophil counts and histamine PC\textsubscript{20} values are shown in the table. There was a wide range of histamine PC\textsubscript{20} values, ranging from 0.03 to 13.5 mg/ml for atopic subjects and from 0.03 to 15.0 mg/ml for non-atopic subjects. Similarly, the eosinophil count showed wide variation, with a mean value of 383 (range 55–915) \(\times 10^6\)/l for the atopic subjects and 310 (range 30–690) \(\times 10^6\)/l for the non-atopic subjects. The mean FEV\textsubscript{1} was 84% predicted.
(range 60–112%) for the atopic subjects and 79% (range 50–107%) for the non-atopic subjects.

There was a significant inverse correlation between baseline eosinophil count and log histamine PC₂₀. For all 23 subjects, \( r = -0.71 \) (\( p < 0.001 \)); for the 14 atopic subjects, \( r = -0.74 \) (\( p < 0.01 \)); for the nine non-atopic subjects, \( r = -0.68 \) (\( p < 0.05 \)), see figure 1. There was an inverse correlation between baseline eosinophil count and baseline FEV₁ in the non-atopic subjects (\( r = -0.65; p < 0.05 \)) but no such correlation in the atopic group (fig 2). There was no correlation between baseline FEV₁ and histamine PC₂₀ for either group and no correlation between age and histamine PC₂₀ or age and eosinophil count.

Discussion

Peripheral blood eosinophilia in asthmatic patients has been recognised since the early 1900s but individual eosinophil counts have shown wide variation in patients who are clinically stable. Eosinophil counts show a diurnal variation with maximal values at night, and this appears to be related to endogenous cortisol levels. Other factors influencing the eosinophil count include physical and mental stress, intercurrent infection, and drug treatment such as systemic corticosteroids, sympathomimetic agents, and aminophylline. For these reasons histamine challenge testing was always performed between 10.00 and 12.00 hours and drugs were withdrawn beforehand.

Bronchial responsiveness can be increased by several factors, including chemical exposure to ozone and respiratory viral infections. These agents may lower the threshold for bronchial smooth muscle contraction during provocation testing by inducing bronchial inflammation. The eosinophil may have a causative role in the development of increased bronchial responsiveness. Major basic protein, present in the crystalloid core of its major granule, in low concentrations can damage various mammalian target cells and organs. Concentrations comparable with those found in the sputum of patients with asthma have been shown to be ciliostatic and to induce damage to tracheal mucosal cells.

The presence of eosinophils in the peripheral blood may not reflect what is happening at other sites directly but eosinophils were found to be prominent in bronchoalveolar lavage fluid from patients with mild asthma. In a previous study by one of the authors, in which blood eosinophil counts were examined in different clinical patterns of asthma, blood eosinophilia was almost invariable in chronic worsening asthma, a condition in which increased bronchial reactivity would be expected. Paradoxically, acute severe asthma was associated with blood eosinopenia, possibly because it provoked a stress response with increased cortisol secretion. Adrenal corticosteroids are a potent cause of eosinopenia; four hours after a 100 mg dose of hydrocortisone eosinophils were almost absent from peripheral blood.

An association between the peripheral blood eosinophil count and the level of bronchial responsiveness after methacholine has been shown in

\[
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\text{Fig 1} & \quad \text{Relationship between total eosinophil count and histamine PC}_20 \quad (a) \quad \text{in the 14 atopic patients and (b) in the nine non-atopic patients.}
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Fig 2 Relationship between total eosinophil count and baseline FEV₁ (% predicted) (a) in the 14 atopic patients and (b) in the nine non-atopic patients.

Subjects who developed an allergen induced late phase reaction, and the eosinophil count increased 24 hours after challenge in these subjects. Our findings are consistent with the initial observations in this study. Total eosinophil counts correlated inversely with FEV₁ in systemic steroid dependent non-atopic asthma in one study, in keeping with our observations, though our non-atopic subjects were not taking systemic steroids.

Smoking has been shown to increase both bronchial responsiveness, and absolute eosinophil count, but since only three of our subjects were current smokers (table), this factor is unlikely to have confounded our results.

A reduction in eosinophil count might be expected to have some beneficial effect on disease activity, either directly or indirectly; and indeed one effect of systemic corticosteroid treatment is a reduction in eosinophil count. The effect of systemic corticosteroid treatment on bronchial responsiveness, however, is not fully established, and studies have shown conflicting results. A recent study of subjects with stable asthma showed that methylprednisolone protected against increased bronchial responsiveness to carbachol, but the effect on eosinophil count was not determined.

Treatment with either inhaled sodium cromoglycate or inhaled corticosteroid produces a small reduction in bronchial responsiveness. Our subjects who were having regular treatment with these agents continued to take them and a similar proportion of treated and untreated subjects were present in the two groups (table). When data on these treated subjects were excluded from the analysis, the same relationship between eosinophil count and bronchial responsiveness was apparent.

We conclude that there is a relationship between the peripheral blood eosinophil count and non-specific bronchial responsiveness in both atopic and non-atopic asthma.
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