Oral Irritation by Mustard Oil: Self-desensitization and Cross-desensitization with Capsaicin
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Abstract

We investigated the temporal pattern of oral irritation elicited by sequential application of mustard oil (allyl-isothiocyanate), and whether it exhibits self-desensitization and cross-desensitization with capsaicin. Mustard oil (0.125%, 40 μl) was sequentially applied to one side of the tongue at 1 min intervals, and subjects rated the intensity of the irritant sensation elicited by each stimulus. Ratings successively declined across trials, indicating desensitization. In contrast, sequential application of capsaicin (10 ppm) elicited irritation that increased in intensity across trials (sensitization). To test for self-desensitization by mustard oil, a 10 min hiatus was imposed following the series of unilateral mustard oil stimuli, after which mustard oil was applied to both sides of the tongue. In a two-alternative forced-choice paradigm, subjects chose which side had stronger irritation and also independently rated the irritant intensity on each side. A significant majority of subjects chose the side not previously receiving mustard oil as more intense, and assigned significantly higher intensity ratings to that side, indicating self-desensitization. In two additional sessions, the same paradigm was used to show mustard oil cross-desensitization of irritation elicited by capsaicin, and capsaicin cross-desensitization of irritation from mustard oil. In a final session, sequential application of mustard oil at faster (20 s) intervals initially evoked a sensitizing pattern followed by desensitization. The temporal patterns of oral irritation exhibited by mustard oil, and its reciprocal cross-desensitization with capsaicin, are similar to those of menthol and nicotine.
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Introduction

Mustard oil (allyl isothiocyanate) is a pungent chemical that imparts the oral irritant sensation of mustard. Mustard oil applied to the skin elicits a burning pain sensation, followed by development of sensitization, which is characterized by hyperalgesia (increased pain to a normally painful stimulus) and allodynia (pain elicited by a non-painful stimulus) (Koltzenburg et al., 1992). It is not known if mustard oil induces sensitization in the oral cavity. Repeated oral application of some irritants, such as capsaicin from chili peppers, at 1 min interstimulus intervals elicits a progressive rise in the intensity of oral irritation that is also called sensitization (Green, 1989; Green and Rentmeister-Bryant, 1998). However, following a hiatus of >3.5 min, re-application of capsaicin induces much weaker irritation due to the development of desensitization (Green, 1989). Repetitive application of other irritants such as nicotine, menthol or zingerone, induces irritation which declines in intensity across trials, a phenomenon also called desensitization (Cliff and Green, 1994; Prescott and Stevenson, 1996; Dessirier et al., 1999, 2001a). However, application of menthol at a shorter interstimulus interval (20 s) initially elicits a sensitizing pattern of irritation, followed in later trials by desensitization (Dessirier et al., 2001a). One aim of the present study was to determine if repetitive application of mustard oil at either short (20 s) or longer (1 min) interstimulus intervals elicits a sensitization or desensitization in the intensity of oral irritation, in comparison with capsaicin.

Pretreating the oral cavity with capsaicin not only reduces the intensity of irritation elicited by subsequent capsaicin (self-desensitization), but also that evoked by other irritants (cross-desensitization) (Green, 1991). The second aim of this study was to determine if mustard oil exhibits self-desensitization and cross-desensitization with capsaicin-evoked oral irritation.

Methods

This study was approved by the UC Davis Human Subjects Review Committee. Twenty-eight subjects (18 F, 10 M; 19–51 years of age) participated in four experimental
sessions that were counterbalanced across subjects. All were students or staff at the university. Subjects were requested not to consume spicy food for 3 days prior to each experimental session, as verified by post hoc interview.

The chemical stimuli used were mustard oil (allyl isothiocyanate; 0.125% in dH₂O; Fluka, St Louis, MO) and capsaicin (10 ppm = 3.3 µM; dissolved in dH₂O from a 1% stock solution in 80% ethanol; Sigma Chemical Co., St Louis, MO). The mustard oil and capsaicin concentrations were approximately matched for sensory intensity as described previously (Dessirier et al., 1997, 1999, 2001b). Briefly, laboratory personnel were tested in a two-alternative forced-choice (2-AFC) procedure in which one filter paper with mustard oil and another with capsaicin were placed onto opposite sides of the tongue. Subjects stated which side had a stronger irritancy. That the mustard oil and capsaicin treated sides were selected in approximately equal numbers verified that the two chemicals were approximately matched in intensity, as confirmed in the Results (see Figure 2A,B, open bars).

For unilateral sequential stimulation, a filter paper disc (1.5 cm diameter, 176.7 mm²; Whatmann, Maidstone, UK) soaked with 40 µl of the mustard oil or capsaicin was placed, with the aid of forceps, onto one side of the anterior dorsal surface of the subject's tongue. The mustard oil was pipetted onto the filter paper just prior to lingual application. The capsaicin filter papers were prepared 2–3 days prior to the experimental session by pipetting the capsaicin onto the filter paper and then air-drying them to allow evaporation of the ethanol vehicle. They were then rewetted with 40 µl dH₂O just prior to lingual application. For bilateral stimulus application, two smaller filter paper discs (1 cm diameter, 78.5 mm²; Whatmann) soaked with 20 µl of mustard oil or capsaicin were placed onto each side of the dorsal tongue surface in a location within the region corresponding to that covered by the larger filter paper stimulus.

For sequential application of mustard oil at 1 min intervals, the first filter paper was applied to one side of the dorsal tongue (side of application was counterbalanced across subjects) and left on for 15 s, after which it was removed. Subjects were asked to rate the intensity of the irritant sensation 10 s after stimulus application. The second stimulus was applied 1 min after the onset of the first stimulus. The procedure was repeated 10 times. For sequential application of capsaicin, the same procedure was followed except that ratings were given 20 s after stimulus application, with the filter paper removed 5 s later. The 10 s difference in timing of mustard oil vs capsaicin ratings was necessary because mustard oil-evoked irritation peaked and subsided more rapidly compared to the irritation elicited by capsaicin. After each application of filter paper subjects held the tongue inside the mouth to avoid any spurious effects of cooling. Subjects were trained to hold the tongue still and not to touch it against the hard palate or cheek so as to avoid spread of the stimulus. Subjects additionally had

the choice to use a dental suction device to remove saliva from the mouth in between filter paper applications.

For sequential application of mustard oil at the shorter, 20 s interval, the first stimulus was applied, the rating given 10 s later, the filter paper removed 5 s after that, and the next filter paper was applied 5 s after that (20 s after the onset of the first stimulus). This procedure was repeated 20 times.

Sequential ratings of irritant intensity were made using a bipolar category scale (Dessirier et al., 1999, 2000a,b, 2001a,b). The scale was centered at '1' and numbers increased to the left and right up to 15 on each side. Ten such scales were printed on a single sheet presented to the subject [see Figure 1 of Dessirier et al. (Dessirier et al., 1999)]. Extensions (16–30, or higher) were available to attach at either end of the scale if needed; the scale was open-ended to reduce or eliminate end effects. No assumptions were made about the nature of the numerical estimates produced (e.g. ratio scale), nor do we claim that the numbers represent absolute values. In this respect, scores were treated as relative measures. Subjects had access to their prior ratings so as to reduce errors of memory (Kim and O’Mahony, 1998). Our rationale is that subjects can judge whether a stimulus-evoked sensation was stronger or weaker than a preceding one, but may give a numeric rating that does not correspond to the perceived change in intensity if they cannot remember the previous number.

Subjects were instructed to rate the first stimulus as having an intensity of 1. Subsequent ratings were made relative to the initial rating. If the intensity was higher, subjects were instructed to mark the number to the right of 1 corresponding to the relative increase in intensity. If the intensity was lower, subjects marked a corresponding number to the left of 1. Subjects thus had continuous access to all prior ratings. For data analysis, the 1 was transformed to 0. Each number to the left of 0 was reduced by 1 and made negative, while each number to the right of 0 was increased by 1 and remained positive. Rating data were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by post hoc Least Significant Difference (LSD) tests to determine if ratings increased or decreased across trials. Significance was assumed at the P < 0.05 level.

Following each sequential stimulus series, a 10 min rest period was imposed during which the subject sat quietly with the mouth closed except during suctioning of saliva. After the rest period, subjects were tested for self- or cross-desensitization.

Either mustard oil or capsaicin (20 µl; 1 cm diameter filter paper) was applied bilaterally to the dorsal tongue surface within the corresponding region that had received the prior stimulus. In a two-alternative forced choice (2-AFC) paradigm, subjects were asked to state which side of the tongue had a stronger irritant sensation. In addition, they rated the irritant intensity independently on each side of the tongue using a 0–10 category scale with 0 = no sensation and 10 = most intense irritation imaginable. The rationale
for using separate rating scales for the bilateral vs sequential ratings is provided in our prior publications (Dessirier et al., 1999, 2001b).

**Results**

When applied to the tongue at an interstimulus interval (ISI) of 1 min, mustard oil elicited a burning sensation that decreased significantly \((F_{9,243} = 8.6; P < 0.001)\) in intensity across trials (Figure 1, open circles). Post hoc LSD tests indicated that by the fifth mustard oil application, the intensity of the perceived burning sensation was significantly \((P < 0.001)\) lower than that elicited by the first application. Ten minutes after the end of the unilateral series of mustard oil stimuli, we tested for self-desensitization by applying mustard oil bilaterally. Indicative of self-desensitization, a significant majority of subjects \((27/28; P < 0.001)\) chose the previously untreated side of the tongue as having the stronger irritant sensation (Figure 2A, 2-AFC, hatched bar) and assigned significantly \((P < 0.001)\) higher ratings to that side of the tongue (Figure 2A, NT, open bar) as compared with the treated side (Figure 2A, T, filled bar). Cross-desensitization to capsaicin was also tested. When capsaicin was applied bilaterally following unilateral mustard oil application, a significant \((26/28; P < 0.001)\) majority of subjects chose the previously untreated side as having a stronger irritant sensation (Figure 2B, 2-AFC, hatched bar). Subjects also assigned significantly \((P < 0.001)\) higher intensity ratings to the untreated side (Figure 2B, NT, open bar) compared with the treated side (Figure 2B, T, filled bar).

In contrast to mustard oil, capsaicin elicited a burning sensation that increased significantly \((F_{9,243} = 10.9; P < 0.001)\) in intensity across trials when applied at an ISI of 1 min (Figure 1; filled triangles). Post hoc LSD tests indicated that the perceived irritant sensation elicited by the fifth capsaicin application was significantly \((P < 0.001)\) higher than that elicited by the first. The ability of capsaicin to cross-desensitize mustard oil irritation was tested 10 min after the end of the unilateral capsaicin series. Following bilateral mustard oil application, a significant majority \((25/28; P < 0.001)\) of subjects chose the untreated side as having the stronger burning sensation (Figure 2C, 2-AFC, hatched bar) and similarly gave significantly \((P < 0.001)\) higher intensity ratings to this side (Figure 2C, NT, open bar) as compared with the side previously treated with capsaicin (Figure 2C, T, filled bar).

To further compare the magnitudes of self- and cross-desensitization, \(d'\) values can be calculated from both 2-AFC and rating data (Ennis, 1993; Bi et al., 1995). Calculated \(d'\) values are provided in Table 1, which also includes data for capsaicin (5 ppm) from a prior study (Dessirier et al., 2001b).

When mustard oil was applied unilaterally to the tongue

![Figure 1. Desensitization by mustard oil and sensitization by capsaicin.](image)

Graph plots mean ratings of irritant intensity across 10 successive presentations of mustard oil (open circle) or capsaicin (filled triangle) at 1 min ISI. Capsaicin and mustard oil irritancy ratings were significantly higher and lower, respectively, at the fifth trial compared with trial 1 (*).
at the faster ISI of 20 s, a different pattern of sensation emerged where an initial sensitization was followed by desensitization (Figure 3); the effect of trial was found to be significant ($F_{19,513} = 3.6; P < 0.001$). Irritancy ratings tended to increase over the initial three trials and then decreased significantly (LSD; $P < 0.05$) by the twelfth application.

**Discussion**

When applied at the relatively long ISI of 1 min, mustard oil elicited a desensitizing pattern of oral irritation such that intensity ratings of irritancy progressively decreased across trials. In contrast, capsaicin elicited a sensitizing pattern of oral irritation when applied at the same ISI. When mustard oil was delivered at the more rapid interval of 20 s, the intensity ratings for irritation initially increased before decreasing, indicating different time courses for the sensitizing and desensitizing properties of this irritant. Furthermore, mustard oil exhibited self-desensitization and a reciprocal cross-desensitization with capsaicin. These properties of mustard oil are discussed further below in comparison with other oral irritant chemicals and possible cellular mechanisms.

**Sensitization and self-desensitization of mustard oil irritation**

The desensitizing pattern of oral irritation elicited by sequentially delivered mustard oil (Figure 1) confirms a recent report that mustard oil vapor delivered to the nasal epithelium elicits a burning sensation that exhibits desensitization when reapplied at long ISIs of 3–4 min (Brand and Jacquot, 2002). The desensitizing pattern observed with mustard oil is very similar to that observed when nicotine (Dessirier et al., 1997), menthol (Cliff and Green, 1994; Dessirier et al., 2001) or zingerone (Prescott and Stevenson, 1999) is sequentially applied at 1 min ISI. When mustard oil was applied at a faster (20 s) ISI, there was an initial pattern of sensitization followed by desensitization (Figure 3) very similar to the biphasic pattern of oral irritation observed with rapid sequential application of menthol (Dessirier et al., 2001), and consistent with the recent report that reaplication of mustard oil vapor to the nasal mucosa at a relatively short ISI (<2 min) elicited increased irritancy ratings (Brand and Jacquot, 2002). These findings suggest that mustard oil (and menthol) initially excite trigeminal nociceptors to elicit irritation and at the same time engage neural mechanisms for both sensitization and desensitization (Green, 1996; Carstens et al., 2002). The desensitizing pattern observed with mustard oil differs from that of capsaicin-evoked irritation in which sensitization predominates at short ISIs (Figure 1), and a longer hiatus (>3.5 min) is required in order for desensitization to overcome sensitization (Stevens and Lawless, 1987; Green, 1989; Dessirier et al., 1997; Green and Rentmeister-Bryant, 1998; Prescott, 1999).

Inspection of Figure 3 reveals an apparent variation in irritancy ratings for mustard oil at the fast (20 s) ISI with a period of ~6 min. It may be speculated that this represents a periodic variation in sensitizing (e.g. release of local inflammatory mediators) vs desensitizing processes.

**Cross-desensitization**

In addition to mustard oil self-desensitization, we presently observed a reciprocal cross-desensitization between mustard oil- and capsaicin-evoked oral irritation. Capsaicin cross-desensitization of oral irritation elicited by other irritant chemicals has been previously reported (Green, 1991) while the present report is, to our knowledge, the first showing mustard oil cross-desensitization. Capsaicin excites cutaneous nociceptors via the molecular VR-1 receptor (Caterina et al., 1997). Capsaicin cross-desensitization to other irritants has been shown in trigeminal ganglion cells (Liu and Simon, 1996a). If capsaicin and mustard oil excite the same trigeminal nociceptive nerve endings in the oral mucosa, then cross-desensitization might be explained if capsaicin reduces the excitability of these nociceptors to subsequent stimulation with mustard oil. Such a reduction in cellular excitability might be mediated by capsaicin acting through VR-1 receptors to induce Ca$^{2+}$ influx into the fiber ending which would, in turn, engage intracellular pathways. Self-desensitization of capsaicin-evoked inward currents is abolished by removal of Ca$^{2+}$ (Liu and Simon, 1996b) or by inhibition of calcineurin, a Ca$^{2+}$-dependent phosphatase (Docherty et al., 1996; Piper et al., 1999). One potential outcome is reduced excitability of voltage-gated Na$^+$

---

**Table 1.** Listed are $d'$ values calculated from 2-AFC and rating data (Ennis, 1993; Bi et al., 1995). All $d'$ values were significant at $P < 0.001$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>2-AFC</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mustard oil self-desensitization</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustard oil cross-desensitization to capsaicin</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capsaicin cross-desensitization to mustard oil</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capsaicin (5 ppm) self-desensitization$^a$</td>
<td>&gt;2.25</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Data from Dessirier et al. (2001b).
channels (Su et al., 1999; Liu et al., 2001), which would render the fibers less sensitive to subsequent stimuli. Cross-desensitization by mustard oil is more difficult to explain, given the current paucity of information regarding its cellular effects. It is not known if mustard oil interacts with a specialized molecular receptor analogous to VR-1 for capsaicin or the cold-menthol receptor (CMR-1) for menthol (McKemy et al., 2002), or if it excites nerve endings via a non-specific action on the plasma membrane (Kress and Reeh, 1996). In any event, the excitatory action of mustard oil presumably engages cellular mechanisms that render the mucosal nociceptors less sensitive to subsequent capsaicin stimulation.

The relative magnitudes of cross-desensitizing effects can be expressed as $d^\prime$ values that can be calculated from 2-AFC data and bilateral intensity ratings (Ennis, 1993; Bi et al., 1995); these values are provided in Table 1. Although we presently did not assess capsaicin self-desensitization, we used comparable data from a previous study employing the same bias-free 2-AFC procedure and using a lower (5 ppm) capsaicin concentration (Dessirier et al., 2001b). The $d^\prime$ values from both 2-AFC and rating data from that study are give in Table 1, and we assume that the higher (10 ppm) capsaicin concentration used in the present study would have resulted in equivalent or stronger self-desensitization. Comparison of $d^\prime$ values indicates that the magnitude of capsaicin self-desensitization was similar to (or slightly greater than) that of capsaicin cross-desensitization of mustard oil (Table 1). This supports the argument that mustard oil primarily excited capsaicin-sensitive nociceptors, although the slightly greater $d^\prime$ values for self- vs cross-desensitization suggests that mustard oil may have also excited a small population of capsaicin-insensitive fibers. Converesely, the degree of mustard oil self-desensitization was greater than mustard oil cross-desensitization of capsaicin, implying that capsaicin activated mustard oil-insensitive nociceptors.

**Modeling the temporal dynamics of oral irritation**

McBurney and colleagues (McBurney et al., 1997, 2001; Balaban et al., 1999) have developed a theoretical model to explain temporal changes in the intensity of capsaicin-evoked oral irritation. Capsaicin (100 ppm) was applied by filter paper at 1 min intervals to the tongue and subjects provided ratings of the intensity of irritation after the first minute and at 3 min intervals thereafter for 34 min. Overall, intensity ratings increased to a plateau after ~15-20 min and tended to decline thereafter. However, there were individual differences, with some subjects’ ratings increasing to a plateau (‘tonic’ pattern), while others showed an initial increase followed by a decline (‘phasic’ pattern), and still others continued to rise (‘rising’ pattern). The model takes account of the different patterns by including a low-pass filter with a 7 min time constant (tonic component or level detector), a high-pass filter with 15 min time constant (phasic component or change detector), and a double integrator (rising component), respectively. By adjusting the gain of the different components, the model successfully fit the different temporal patterns as well as adaptation of capsaicin irritation across days (McBurney et al., 1997) and cross-adaptation between zingerone and vanilloids (Affeltranger et al., 2002).

We assume that the components of the McBurney and Balaban model should ultimately have underlying cellular mechanisms. We propose that sensitization is mediated largely by spatial recruitment of nociceptors as the irritant chemical diffuses through epithelial tissue, and that desensitization involves cellular process leading to reduced excitability of the nociceptor nerve endings (see above). These two processes may occur simultaneously. Capsaicin has limited diffusion through the epithelium so that spatial recruitment occurs over a longer time course. During this time, desensitization also starts to build up. The net perception is the difference between the two processes. During sensitization spatial recruitment is greater than desensitization, whereas both processes are in equilibrium when the sensation reaches a plateau. When the maximal degree of spatial recruitment is reached (the rate of diffusion equals the rate of clearance of the irritant chemical), overall irritation ratings should start to decline due to continued desensitization; this pattern was observed by McBurney et al. (McBurney et al., 1997). In contrast, mustard oil diffuses more readily through epithelial tissue, such that maximal spatial recruitment of nociceptors may already be achieved after the first application. The overall decline in irritant ratings thereafter can be attributed to progressive desensitization of the nociceptors. Conceivably, spatial recruitment and physiological desensitization of nerve endings may represent the cellular bases for the ‘tonic’ and ‘phasic’ processes of the model proposed by McBurney and colleagues.

**Comparison with hairy skin**

Most prior psychophysical studies investigating the irritant properties of mustard oil have been conducted on hairy skin (LaMotte et al., 1982; Margerl et al., 1990; Handwerker et al., 1991; Koltzenburg et al., 1992). When applied to the skin, mustard oil evoked a burning sensation and induced primary and secondary hyperalgesia (Koltzenburg et al., 1992) that may be due to peripheral and central sensitization, respectively (Torebjörk et al., 1992). In human microneurography experiments, sensations of pain evoked by cutaneous mustard oil application correlated with activity in C-fiber polymodal nociceptors (Handwerker et al., 1991). The recruitment of myelinated nociceptive fibers may also contribute to hyperalgesia (Treede et al., 1995). The development of hyperalgesia following cutaneous mustard oil application is at odds with our observation of self-desensitization in the oral cavity, suggesting important differences in the chemosensory properties of these two tissues that deserve further investigation. One obvious
difference is the greater accessibility of irritant chemicals to nociceptive endings in lingual and nasal epithelia as compared with skin.

In animal studies, mustard oil injected under the skin (Handwerker et al., 1987; Lippe et al., 1993a,b; Dux et al., 1996) or into the temporomandibular joint (Haas et al., 1992; Bereiter and Benetti, 1996; Yu et al., 1996; Fiorentino et al., 1999) has been used extensively to study the neuroinflammatory properties of this chemical. The inflammatory response evoked by mustard oil was unaffected by pretreatment with histamine H1 and 5-HT receptor antagonists as well as ruthenium red, a non-specific VR-1 channel blocker (Inoue et al., 1997), suggesting that neither mast cell degranulation nor VR-1 are important components in mustard oil sensitization. Similarly, tachykinin NK2 and NK3 antagonists were not effective in reducing mustard oil-induced inflammation (Inoue et al., 1997). However, pre-treating the skin with the NK1 antagonist SR 140 333 completely blocked the neurogenic skin inflammation in mouse skin (Inoue et al., 1997), suggesting that substance-P is an important mediator of the mustard oil-induced inflammatory response.
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