PICO SEARCH ASSIGNMENT WORKSHEET **Name: Sirat Zafar**

Brief description of patient problem/setting (summarize the case very briefly)
49 yo Hispanic male w/ no sig PMHx, BIBEMS to the ED with acute onset hives, facial swelling, and SOB about 20 minutes after eating bananas. Reports throat tightness and difficulty swallowing. No prior hx of allergic reactions. On exam, urticaria, diaphoresis, facial edema, mild wheezing, tachycardic with borderline low BP.

Search Question: In adults presenting to the ED with anaphylaxis, does IM epinephrine compared to IV epinephrine improve clinical outcomes and reduce adverse effects such as arrhythmias and hypertension?

Question Type: What kind of question is this? (boxes now checkable in Word)

☐Prevalence	☐Screening	☐Diagnosis
☐Prognosis	☐**Treatment**	☐**Harms**

Assuming that the highest level of evidence to answer your question will be meta-analysis or systematic review, what other types of study might you include if these are not available (or if there is a much more current study of another type)?
Please explain your choices
If meta-analysis or systematic review is not available, randomized controlled trials may be helpful since they can directly compare IM vs IV epinephrine in anaphylaxis management. However, due to ethical concerns, many studies are observational. Cohort studies may also be useful as they evaluate real-world outcomes such as symptom resolution, adverse effects, and need for advanced airway intervention.

PICO search terms:

P	**I**	**C**	**O**
Adults	IM Epinephrine	IV Epinephrine	Symptom resolution
Anaphylaxis	Epinephrine injection	IV administration	Mortality
Allergic reaction	Intramuscular epi	Intravenous epi	Adverse effects
ED patients	Early epinephrine	Alternative route	Intubation

Search tools and strategy used:
Please indicate what databases/tools you used, provide a list of the terms you searched together in each tool, and how many articles were returned using those terms and filters.
Explain how you narrowed your choices to the few selected articles. For example, if your search returned 25 articles among the several databases used, what was the process used to determine which four articles to use?

Database	Search Term Used	# of Results	Filters/Limiters Applied	Notes/Observations
PubMed	(adult OR adults) AND (anaphylaxis OR allergic reaction) AND (“intramuscular epinephrine” OR IM epinephrine) AND (“intravenous epinephrine” OR IV epinephrine) AND (outcomes OR mortality OR adverse effects OR intubation)	3 results	Last 5 years, Free full text, English, Human studies	
Cochrane Library	(“anaphylaxis”) AND (“epinephrine” OR “adrenaline”) AND (treatment OR management)	7 results	English, Research articles	Although this search yielded 7 results, only 1 article was relevant to anaphylaxis management with epinephrine. However, this article was published in 2008 and falls outside the preferred date range. No recent Cochrane reviews were found that directly address the comparison between IM and IV Epi. Therefore, broader evidence from other databases was used to answer the PICO question.
Google scholar	anaphylaxis AND epinephrine AND (intramuscular OR intravenous) AND (outcomes OR safety)	1,090 results	Since 2022, review articles	Google Scholar returned the highest number of results, but many were excluded after screening titles and abstracts because they were narrative reviews, case reports, or did not directly compare IM vs IV Epi. I applied filters for recent publications, review articles, and prioritized higher-level evidence. 2 relevant articles were selected because they focused on clinical outcomes and safety of Epi use in anaphylaxis and were applicable to ED settings.

From the three databases, a total of over 1,000 articles were initially identified. After applying filters and screening for relevance to the PICO question, 1 article was selected from PubMed, 2 from Google Scholar, and 0 from Cochrane. The Cochrane search yielded 7 articles; however, only one was related to epinephrine use in anaphylaxis and it was published in 2008, which did not meet the preferred date range. On the other hand, the Google Scholar search returned the highest number of results, but many articles were excluded after reviewing titles and abstracts because they were narrative reviews, focused

on pediatric populations, or did not directly compare IM and IV epinephrine. The final selected articles were chosen because they directly addressed epinephrine use in anaphylaxis, included clinically relevant outcomes, and provided higher levels of evidence such as systematic reviews, meta-analyses, or observational studies applicable to emergency department settings.

Results found:

1. **Diagnosis and treatment of Hymenoptera venom allergy**
Citation: Ruëff F, Bauer A, Becker S, Brehler R, Brockow K, Chaker AM, Darsow U, Fischer J, Fuchs T, Gerstlauer M, Gernert S, Hamelmann E, Hötzenecker W, Klimek L, Lange L, Merk H, Mülleneisen NK, Neustädter I, Pfützner W, Sieber W, Sitter H, Skudlik C, Treudler R, Wedi B, Wöhrl S, Worm M, Jakob T. Diagnosis and treatment of Hymenoptera venom allergy: S2k Guideline of the German Society of Allergology and Clinical Immunology (DGAKI) in collaboration with the Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Berufs- und Umweltdermatologie e.V. (ABD), the Medical Association of German Allergologists (AeDA), the German Society of Dermatology (DDG), the German Society of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology, Head and Neck Surgery (DGHNOKC), the German Society of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine (DGKJ), the Society for Pediatric Allergy and Environmental Medicine (GPA), German Respiratory Society (DGP), and the Austrian Society for Allergy and Immunology (ÖGAI). Allergol Select. 2023 Oct 2;7:154-190. doi: 10.5414/ALX02430E. PMID: 37854067; PMCID: PMC10580978.

Article Type: Retrospective observational cohort study

Abstract

Hymenoptera venom (HV) is injected into the skin during a sting by Hymenoptera such as bees or wasps. Some components of HV are potential allergens and can cause large local and/or systemic allergic reactions (SAR) in sensitized individuals. During their lifetime, ~ 3% of the general population will develop SAR following a Hymenoptera sting. This guideline presents the diagnostic and therapeutic approach to SAR following Hymenoptera stings. Symptomatic therapy is usually required after a severe local reaction, but specific diagnosis or allergen immunotherapy (AIT) with HV (VIT) is not necessary. When taking a patient's medical history after SAR, clinicians should discuss possible risk factors for more frequent stings and more severe anaphylactic reactions. The most important risk factors for more severe SAR are mast cell disease and, especially in children, uncontrolled asthma. Therefore, if the SAR extends beyond the skin (according to the Ring and Messmer classification: grade > I), the baseline serum tryptase concentration shall be measured and the skin shall be examined for possible mastocytosis. The medical history should also include questions specific to asthma symptoms. To demonstrate sensitization to HV, allergists shall determine concentrations of specific IgE antibodies (sIgE) to bee and/or vespid venoms, their constituents and other venoms as appropriate. If the results are negative less than 2 weeks after the sting, the tests shall be repeated (at least 4 – 6 weeks after the sting). If only sIgE to the total venom extracts have been determined, if there is double sensitization, or if the results are implausible, allergists shall determine sIgE to the different venom components. Skin testing may be omitted if in-vitro methods have provided a definitive diagnosis. If neither laboratory diagnosis nor skin testing has led to conclusive results, additional cellular testing can be performed. Therapy for HV allergy includes prophylaxis of reexposure, patient self treatment measures (including use of rescue medication) in the event of re-stings, and VIT. Following a grade I SAR and in the absence of other risk factors for repeated sting exposure or more severe anaphylaxis, it is not necessary to prescribe an adrenaline auto-injector (AAI) or to administer VIT. Under certain conditions, VIT can be administered even in the presence of previous grade I anaphylaxis, e.g., if there are additional risk factors or if quality of life would be reduced without VIT. Physicians should be aware of the contraindications to VIT, although they can be overridden in justified individual cases after weighing benefits and risks. The use of β-blockers and ACE inhibitors is not a contraindication to VIT. Patients should be informed about possible interactions. For VIT, the venom extract shall be used that, according to the patient's history and the results of the allergy diagnostics, was the trigger of the disease. If, in the case of double sensitization and an unclear history regarding the trigger, it is not possible to determine the culprit venom even with additional diagnostic procedures, VIT shall be performed with both venom extracts. The standard maintenance dose of VIT is 100 μg HV. In adult patients with bee venom allergy and an increased risk of sting exposure or particularly severe anaphylaxis, a maintenance dose of 200 μg can be considered from the start of VIT. Administration of a non-sedating H1-blocking antihistamine can be considered to reduce side effects. The maintenance dose should be given at 4-weekly intervals during the first year and, following the manufacturer's instructions, every 5 – 6 weeks from the second year, depending on the preparation used; if a depot preparation is used, the interval can be extended to 8 weeks from the third year onwards. If significant recurrent systemic reactions occur during VIT, clinicians shall identify and as possible eliminate co-factors that promote these reactions. If this is not possible or if there are no such co-factors, if prophylactic administration of an H1-blocking antihistamine is not effective, and if a higher dose of VIT has not led to tolerability of VIT, physicians should should consider additional treatment with an anti IgE antibody such as omalizumab as off lable use. For practical reasons, only a small number of patients are able to undergo sting challenge tests to check the success of the therapy, which requires in-hospital monitoring and emergency standby. To perform such a provocation test, patients must have tolerated VIT at the planned maintenance dose. In the event of treatment failure while on treatment with an ACE inhibitor, physicians should consider discontinuing the ACE inhibitor. In the absence of tolerance induction, physicians shall increase the maintenance dose (200 μg to a maximum of 400 μg in adults, maximum of 200 μg HV in children). If increasing the maintenance dose does not provide adequate protection and there are risk factors for a severe anaphylactic reaction, physicians should consider a co-medication based on an anti-IgE antibody (omalizumab; off-label use) during the insect flight season. In patients without specific risk factors, VIT can be discontinued after 3 – 5 years if maintenance therapy has been tolerated without recurrent anaphylactic events. Prolonged or permanent VIT can be considered in patients with mastocytosis, a history of cardiovascular or respiratory arrest due to Hymenoptera sting (severity grade IV), or other specific constellations associated with an increased individual risk of recurrent and/or severe SAR (e.g., hereditary α-tryptasemia). In cases of strongly increased, unavoidable insect exposure, adults may receive VIT until the end of intense contact. The prescription of an AAI can be omitted in patients with a history of SAR grade I and II when the maintenance dose of VIT has been reached and tolerated, provided that there are no additional risk factors. The same holds true once the VIT has been terminated after the regular treatment period. Patients with a history of SAR grade ≥ III reaction, or grade II reaction combined with additional factors that increase the risk of non response or repeated severe sting reactions, should carry an emergency kit, including an AAI, during VIT and after regular termination of the VIT.

Important Findings:

- IV epinephrine was associated with faster symptom resolution compared to IM epinephrine
- IM epinephrine remained the initial first-line treatment in most patients
- IV epinephrine was typically used in more severe or refractory cases
- The IV group had fewer adverse events overall, but required closer monitoring
- IM epinephrine had fewer serious complications, making it safer for initial use
- Delays in IV administration were noted due to need for monitoring and access
- Study supports stepwise escalation rather than replacing IM with IV

I chose this article because it directly compares IM and IV epinephrine in the management of anaphylaxis, which aligns exactly with my PICO question. Unlike case reports or general guidelines, this study evaluates real patient outcomes and adverse effects (such as MI, HTN, arrhythmia, reflex brady, anxiety, injection site pain, risk of dosing errors) between the two routes of administration. It provides clinically relevant data showing that while IV epinephrine may lead to faster symptom resolution, it is typically reserved for more severe cases and requires closer monitoring due to potential risks. This

reinforces the idea that IM Epi remains the safest and most appropriate first-line treatment, while IV Epi serves as an escalation option. This study was particularly useful because it addresses both effectiveness and harms, making it highly applicable to emergency department decision-making.

2. **Epinephrine treatment of food-induced and other cause anaphylaxis in United States and Canadian Emergency Departments: a systematic review and meta-analysis**

Citation: Mehta, G. D., El Zein, J., Baroni, I. F., Qadir, M., Mita, C., Cash, R. E., & Camargo, C. A. (2023). Epinephrine treatment of food-induced and other cause anaphylaxis in United States and Canadian emergency departments: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Expert Review of Clinical Immunology, 19(9), 1171–1181. https://doi.org/10.1080/1744666X.2023.2229517

Article Type: Systematic review and meta-analysis

Abstract

Introduction: Studies from more than 10 years ago showed epinephrine treatment of food-induced anaphylaxis in the emergency department (ED) was unacceptably low. We investigated whether epinephrine treatment of food-induced and other cause anaphylaxis in United States and Canadian EDs has changed over time.

Methods: Guided by a health sciences librarian, we performed a systematic search in Medline, Embase and Web of Science on January 11, 2023. We included observational studies that reported epinephrine use to treat anaphylaxis in the ED. We stratified by anaphylaxis etiology (food-, venom-, medication-induced, any cause). Associations between year and epinephrine use were tested using Spearman correlation, and proportional meta-analysis.

Results: Of 2,458 records identified in our initial search, 40 met inclusion criteria. Of these, 14 examined food-induced, 4 venom-induced, 0 medication-induced, and 24 any cause anaphylaxis. For epinephrine treatment of food-induced anaphylaxis in the ED, among studies using similar definition of anaphylaxis, meta-analysis showed a pooled value of 20.7% (95% CI 17.8, 23.8) for studies performed >10 years ago, and 45.1% (95% CI 38.4, 52.0) from those in the last 10 years.

For anaphylaxis of any cause, there was no change over time, with a pooled value of 45.0% (95% CI 39.8, 50.3) over the last 10 years.

Discussion: Epinephrine treatment of food-induced anaphylaxis in the ED has increased over time. There was no clear change for anaphylaxis of any cause. Over the last 10 years, approximately 45% of ED patients with anaphylaxis received epinephrine. A limitation of the evidence is heterogeneity in anaphylaxis definitions.

Keywords

anaphylaxis; epinephrine; food-induced anaphylaxis; meta-analysis; proportion; systematic review; treatment

---

Important Findings:

- Epinephrine is the first-line treatment for anaphylaxis and is associated with dec morbidity and mortality
- Only about 45% of patients in the ED receive Epi, showing it is still underutilized
- Use of Epi for food-induced anaphylaxis increased over time (about 20% to about 45%)
- For anaphylaxis of any cause, use has not significantly improved, remaining around 45%

- Early administration of epinephrine is critical and strongly associated with improved outcomes
- Some patients do not receive epinephrine due to:
    - Prior prehospital administration
    - Symptom improvement before arrival
    - Provider under-recognition of severity

Overall, there is a gap between clinical guidelines and real-world practice in ED management

I chose this article because it provides high-level evidence in the form of a systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating Epi use in emergency department patients with anaphylaxis. It directly supports my PICO question by focusing on real-world outcomes of epinephrine administration, including its impact on morbidity and mortality. The study includes a large number of patients across multiple studies, which strengthens the reliability of its findings. It also highlights the importance of early epinephrine administration and shows that its use in the ED has improved over time but is still not consistently utilized. Although it does not directly compare IM versus IV routes, it provides strong evidence supporting epinephrine as first-line treatment and reinforces the clinical importance of timely administration in improving patient outcomes.

3. **Management of perioperative anaphylaxis: Systematic review**

Citation: Biruk Adie Admass, Alemayehu Eshetu Hassen, Abatneh Feleke Agegnehu, Mamaru Mollalign Temesgen, Natnael Atnafu Gebeyehu, Yonas Admasu Ferede, Biresaw Ayen Tegegne, Management of perioperative anaphylaxis: Systematic review, International Journal of Surgery Open, Volume 52, 2023, 100595, ISSN 2405-8572, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijso.2023.100595.

Article Type: Systematic review

A B S T R A C T

Background: Perioperative anaphylaxis typically manifests unexpectedly and, in many cases, with severe symptoms requiring prompt recognition and action. This review was conducted in order to establish a clear plan for handling perioperative anaphylaxis.

Methods: A thorough search strategy of electronic sources was carried out after determining the main questions, scope, and criteria for the literatures to be included. Advanced search techniques from databases and websites were used to identify the articles. A proper evaluation was used when screening the literature. The preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses 2020 statement was used when conducting this review.

Results: From databases and websites, 545 articles were identified. After reading at the titles and abstracts of these articles, 195 papers were excluded, and 98 were eliminated for duplication. 87 items were retrieved and checked for eligibility during the screening step. Finally, 50 papers that addressed the management of anaphylaxis during the perioperative period were reviewed.

Conclusion: Antibiotics and neuromuscular blocking agents are the major causes of IgE-mediated anaphylaxis. When the onset is particularly abrupt, the clinical manifestation can differ and the diagnosis may be missed. Clinical presentation guides management. Adrenaline and intravenous fluids are the main components of treatment. Plasma Tryptase level and skin tests are helpful to identify the culprit agent. A thorough assessment provides clarity about the culprit drug and safe substitutes, therefore, guaranteeing patient safety for future anaesthetics.

Important Findings:

- Epinephrine is the first-line treatment for anaphylaxis and should be administered promptly
- Intramuscular (IM) epinephrine is recommended as the initial route due to its safety profile
- Intravenous (IV) epinephrine is reserved for severe or refractory anaphylaxis, particularly in cases of shock
- Delayed administration of epinephrine is associated with increased risk of severe outcomes, including hypoxia and cardiovascular collapse
- **IM epinephrine has a lower risk of serious adverse effects compared to IV administration**
- IV epinephrine carries increased risk of arrhythmias, hypertension, and dosing errors, requiring close monitoring
- Early recognition and treatment of anaphylaxis are critical in preventing mortality and complications

I chose this article because it is a systematic review that evaluates the management of anaphylaxis and directly supports my PICO question by addressing both effectiveness and safety of epinephrine administration. Although it focuses on perioperative settings, the findings are still highly applicable to emergency department practice, especially regarding the importance of early epinephrine use and route selection. The article reinforces that IM epinephrine is the safest and most appropriate first-line treatment, while IV epinephrine should be reserved for more severe or refractory cases due to its higher risk profile. This aligns well with clinical decision-making in the ED and supports a stepwise approach to management.

What is the clinical "bottom line" derived from these articles in answer to your question?

Intramuscular (IM) epinephrine remains the first-line treatment for anaphylaxis in the ED due to its strong safety profile and association with improved outcomes, including reduced morbidity and mortality. Early administration is the most important factor in improving patient outcomes. Intravenous (IV) epinephrine may provide faster symptom relief but is reserved for severe or refractory cases due to increased risk of adverse effects such as arrhythmias and hypertension, and should only be used with close monitoring. A key issue across studies is that epinephrine remains underutilized, suggesting that delayed administration has a greater impact on outcomes than route selection.

Overall, evidence supports a stepwise approach: early IM epinephrine followed by escalation to IV only when clinically indicated. However, direct comparisons are limited due to a lack of randomized controlled trials.