

## Blocking endogenous peroxidases: a cautionary note for immunohistochemistry

Dear Editor,

In two recent JCOMM papers dealing with the staining of various human tissue antigens, divergent approaches for blocking endogenous peroxidase activity were reported. As such, Gray *et al.* [1] inhibited this intrinsic enzyme with a 0.9% hydrogen peroxide (H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>) solution whereas Ranieri *et al.* [2] performed the blockade with a 3% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> solution. This arbitrariness has prompted our present letter.

Immunohistochemistry (IHC) applied to formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded tissue samples is governed by standard operating procedures like any other methodology in biomedicine. One important milestone in IHC standardization has been the revelation of endogenous biotin as a confounding factor along with measures to minimize its contribution to causing staining errors [3–5]. However, IHC pitfalls can also have other origins such as the insufficient quenching of endogenous peroxidases whenever using peroxidase-based detection methods. Despite the existence of expert manuals according to which these enzymes should be inhibited by applying a solution containing 3% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> [6] and studies abiding by this recommendation [2, 5, 7–9], some research groups still publish staining approaches in which blockade has erroneously been performed with less concentrated H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> solutions, e.g. by means of a 0.9% [1] or even 0.3% [10] solution. In this context, it was already shown that, for instance, when endogenous peroxidases were blocked by means of a 0.3% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> solution a breast carcinoma was (falsely) positive for a particular protein, yet when blockade was performed by employing a 3% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> solution, the same specimen stained negatively for that antigen [9]. It should be emphasized that all other conditions including primary antibody concentrations were identical in the two experimental arms at a given incubation temperature [9].

Therefore, the purpose of this note is to alert investigators to henceforth implement established techniques to avoid this mistake in order to prevent the emergence of staining artifacts associated with falsely positive IHC results and consequently augment the comparability of data generated in different laboratories on the same subject of interest. Given the increasing importance of proteomics and (intracellular) protein biomarkers for the diagnosis of human disease, appropriate countermeasures to avert this immunohistochemical pitfall should have particular relevance.

**Razvan Tudor Radulescu\***  
*Molecular Concepts Research (MCR)*  
*Munich, Germany*

**Thomas Boenisch**  
*DakoCytomation*  
*Carpinteria, CA, USA.*

\*Correspondence to: PD Dr. med. R. T. RADULESCU, M.D.  
*Molecular Concepts Research (MCR), Munich, Germany*

1. **Gray SE, Kay E, Leader M, Mabruk M.** Analysis of p16 expression and allelic imbalance/loss of heterozygosity of 9p21 in cutaneous squamous cell carcinomas. *J Cell Mol Med.* 2006; 10: 778–88.
2. **Ranieri G, Grammatica L, Patruno R, Zito AF, Valerio P, Iacobellis S, Gadaleta C, Gasparini G, Ribatti D.** A possible role of thymidine phosphorylase expression and 5-fluorouracil increased sensitivity in oropharyngeal cancer patients. *J Cell Mol Med.* 2007; 11: 362–68.
3. **Bussolati G, Gugliotta P, Volante M, Pace M, Papotti M.** Retrieved endogenous biotin: a novel marker and a potential pitfall in diagnostic immunohistochemistry. *Histopathology.* 1997; 31: 400–7.
4. **Iezzoni JC, Mills SE, Pelkey TJ, Stoler MH.** Inhibin is not an immunohistochemical marker for hepatocellular carcinoma. An example of the potential pitfall in diagnostic immunohistochemistry caused by endogenous biotin. *Am J Clin Pathol.* 1999; 111: 229–34.
5. **Kim SH, Jung KC, Shin YK, Lee KM, Park YS, Choi YL, Oh KI, Kim MK, Chung DH, Song HG, Park SH.** The enhanced reactivity of endogenous biotin-like molecules by antigen retrieval procedures and signal amplification with tyramine. *Histochem J.* 2002; 34: 97–103.
6. **Boenisch T.** Handbook of immunochemical staining methods. 2003; 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Dako Cytomation Corp., Carpinteria, CA, USA.
7. **Cook DG, Leverenz JB, McMillan PJ, Kulstad JJ, Erickson S, Roth RA, Schellenberg GD, Jin L-W, Kovacina KS, Craft S.** Reduced hippocampal insulin-degrading enzyme in late-onset Alzheimer's disease is associated with the apolipoprotein E-e4 allele. *Am J Pathol.* 2003; 162: 313–9.
8. **Radulescu RT, Hufnagel C, Luppa P, Hellebrand H, Kuo W-L, Rosner MR, Harbeck N, Giersig C, Meindl A, Schmitt M, Weirich G.** Immunohistochemical demonstration of the zinc metalloprotease insulin-degrading enzyme in normal and malignant human breast: correlation with tissue insulin levels. *Int J Oncol.* 2007; 30: 73–80.
9. **Radulescu RT, Jahn A, Hellmann D, Weirich G.** Immunohistochemical pitfalls in the demonstration of insulin-degrading enzyme in normal and neoplastic human tissues. *arXiv.* 2007; 0705.0374v1 [q-bio.TO].
10. **Uhlén M, Björling E, Agaton C, Szgyarto CA, Amini B, Andersen E, Andersson AC, Angelidou P, Asplund A, Asplund C, Berglund L, Bergström K, Brumer H, Cerjan D, Ekström M, Elobeid A, Eriksson C, Fagerberg L, Falk R, Fall J, Forsberg M, Björklund MG, Gumbel K, Halimi A, Hallin I, Hamsten C, Hansson M, Hedhammar M, Hercules G, Kampf C, Larsson K, Lindskog M, Lodewyckx W, Lund J, Lundeberg J, Magnusson K, Malm E, Nilsson P, Odling J, Oksvold P, Olsson I, Oster E, Ottosson J, Paavilainen L, Persson A, Rimini R, Rockberg J, Runeson M, Sivertsson A, Skölleremo A, Steen J, Stenvall M, Sterky F, Strömberg S, Sundberg M, Tegel H, Tourle S, Wahlund E, Waldén A, Wan J, Wernérus H, Westberg J, Wester K, Wrethagen U, Xu LL, Hober S, Pontén F.** A human protein atlas for normal and cancer tissues based on antibody proteomics. *Mol Cell Proteomics.* 2005; 4: 1920–32.

E-mail: [ratura@gmx.net](mailto:ratura@gmx.net)