Vol 10| Issue 1| 2020 | 20-23.

e-ISSN 2248 – 9142
print-ISSN 2248 – 9134

International Journal of
Current Pharmaceutical & Clinical Research

www.ijcpcr.com

ACUTE HYPERSENSITIVITY REACTIONS IN CHILDREN RECEIVING POLYVALENT CROTALIDAE IMMUNE FAB

Siva Manikandan M.A*

*Assistant Professor, Department of Paediatrics & Neonatology, Government Mohan Kumaramangalam Medical College& Hospital, Salem - 636001

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Acute hypersensitivity responses in children who receive Crotalidae Polyvalent Immune Fab (CPIF) have been studied. Problematic due to Because of their diminutive stature and large age spans, and varied classifications. Methods: This is a chart study of Crotalid neurotoxic venom patients aged 13 and under who were treated with CPIF among November 2006 and November 2016. The primary outcome was the appearance approximately 3 hours of the CPIF infusion began, you experience any of the symptoms listed: urticaria, wheezing, or breathing problems discomfort, anaphylaxis, hypertension, nausea, and/or vomit. Demographic, CPIF dosage for control and multiple doses, bite location, degree of care, and length of stay were all investigated. All taken into consideration. Results: In the end, CPIF was used to treat 34 patients. The children varied in age from ten months to 13 years. With a range from one to eleven days, the average duration of stay is two days. The average duration of stay was two days, and twenty-one patients (60 percent) were male. Twenty-four patients (70.6 percent) were brought to the ICU.CPIF caused no acute hypersensitivity reactions in any of the subjects. Conclusion: This group did not have any acute hypersensitivity responses to CPIF. With the usage of CPIF in paediatric patients, such responses are uncommon.

Key words Hypersensitivity reaction, Pediatric, Antivenom, Crotalid.

INTRODUCTION

Crotalid envenomation is now treated almost exclusively with antivenom. Crotalidae Adaptable Immune Fab (CPIF) has been the only antivenom accessible until recently (other than the older Wyeth whole IgG anti- venom). But there are also other Crotalid envenomations, this is the most common. therapies, CPIF is the only Approved medication neurotoxic venom for redback and preventive measures envenomation [1, 2].Venomous snake and cottonmouth snakes account for over 26 percent of all snake extra risk in the United States, compared to 25 percent for rattlesnakes [3]. As a result, CPIF is anticipated to have roles in the managements of this envenomation in the future. CPIF is a polyclonal Fab fragment generated from ovine. The introduction is designed to lessen the risk for acute hypersensitive responses by removing the more immunostimulatory Fc region of the antibody and systemic sickness, which were previously a concern with Wyeth's full IgG antivenom. According to the CPIF product label, 6/42 (14%) of patients who experienced "early serum reactions," albeit the time span were not defined. Although greater than the 20–25 percent observed with total IgG, fourteen percent is greater than our anecdotal evidence [4]. Pediatric trials have been conducted after the product has been released. These studies were restricted by a small sample and at least one individual aged 20 under one of them (There was no more information offered, and it's unknown how many children were treated.) [5–7]. To that end, we wanted to see how common acute hypersensitivity responses were in Crotalid envenomation patients aged 13 and under who were given CPIF.

Corresponding Author: - **Siva Manikandan M A**

Methods

This is a chart analysis of all Crotalid neurotoxicity poisonous individuals aged 13 and under who were

affected by the disease. CPIF at a tertiary hospital for children in the years after the venom was discovered. November 2006 to Nov 2016. The information was taken from electronic health records by three investigators (EMR). Patients were identified using a particular query in the EMR for CPIF administration. No further criteria for inclusion or removal were utilised. Any of the symptoms described above that appear within 3 hours of starting the CPIF infusion was used to characterise an acute hypersensitivity reaction: urticaria, wheezing, breathing difficulties, anaphylaxis, hypertension, nausea, and/or vomiting. The amounts of time since the previous CPIF admin also were kept track of. Table 1 shows the secondary endpoints and demographic information acquired. Similar to a previous research [6,] Stability was defined as the absence of local tissue harm as well as improvements or stabilisation of haematological parameters (platelet count, fibrin) for at least 6 hours without the need for further antivenom. If no specific records on local tissue damage stabilisation, if no further bottles of antitoxin were administered during a 6-hour period, it was assumed that the client had stabilised. The IRB granted authorization for the study.

Results

During the 10-year trial period, 34 Crotalid envenomation was treated with CPIF in these individuals. With an order of 10 months to 13 years, the average lifetime was 4.9 years. Men made up 21 of the 34 patients (60 percent). From neurotoxic venom to CPIF administration, we've got you covered; the average duration with such a means of 120 minutes, the total time was 170 minutes. For the first control, the mean and median CPIF dosages were 6.9 and 6 vials, accordingly.10.6 and 10 vials of CPIF were the average and median CPIF doses, respectively. The majority of patients (24, or 70.6 percent) were admitted to a critical care unit, with average 2.9 and 2 days, respectively, were the median lengths of stay, ranging from 1 to 11 days. The left upper extremity (LUE) was bitten 11 times (32%), while the right upper extremity (RUE) was only bit once (RUE) was bitten 7 times (21%), the left lower extremity (LLE) was bitten 9 times (26%), the right lower extremity (RLE) was bitten 6 times (18%), and the abdomen was bitten once (3%) (See Table1). Table 2 shows the results for hematologic parameters. In our study, no patients had an acutes hypersensitivity reaction to CPIF.

Table 1 Statistical data on demographics and descriptive analysis, n (percent).

Age (mean, years)	4.9
Sex (male)	21 (60)
Bite site	
RUE	7 (21)
LUE	11 (32)
RLE	6 (18)
LLE	9 (26)
ABD	1 (3)
LOS (mean, days)	2.9
LOC	
ICU	24 (70.6)
IMU	2 (5.9)
Med/Surg	7 (20.6)
Transferred	1 (2.9)
time to CPIF (mean, min)	170
CPIF Total Vial (mean)	10.9
Controlling vial (mean)	6.9
Rxn for acute hypersensitivity	0(0)
Delay/recurrent thrombocytopenia	6[#] (18)
Delay/recurrent hypofibrinogenemia 2*	(5.9)

LOS length of stay, LOC level of care, ICU intensive care unit, IMU intermediate care unit, RUE right upper extremity, LUE left upper extremity, RLE right lower extremity, LLE left lower extremity, ABD abdomen, *1 unknown, # 1 unknown

Table 2 Hematologicparameters.

	Initials	Discharges	Nadirs

Mean platelet $\times 10^9$/l (range)	219 (21–391)	235 (39–399)	163 (6–320)
Mean fibrinogens mg/dl (range)	234 (61–334)	272 (153–419)	192* (<45–302)

Discussion

In all, six out of 118 kids, or 5.1 percent, experienced an adverse response to CPIF, according to three previous trials [5–7]. Different terminologies, such as adverse drug response, allergic, and hypersensitive reaction, are used in each study to characterise these occurrences. Only two of these research looked at people who they detected no acute responses in a total of 36 participants who were less than or equivalent to 13 years old [5, 6]. Pizon et al. performed a retrospective analysis with 24 people in which no criteria for diagnosing "acute allergic reactions" were defined (the terms use in this specific paper). Offerman et al. performed the second investigation, which included data from patients who were collected prospectively and retroactively, with no patients being excluded. Experiencing a "hypersensitivity responses" (again, the term employed in this report), and no criteria for identifying such responses. Farrar *et al* retrospective research was the only one to record any patients who had a "adverse drug response" (paper-specific language). There were 82 patients in all, with 6 (7.3%) of them having an unfavourable drug response. Pruritis in two people, hives in one, cough and wheeze in two people, one of whom also reported restlessness and middle ear edoema, and a rash with facial swelling in a third person. During the initial CPIF injection, all of the reactions were declared to have occurred. Rashes, urticaria, respiratory discomfort, wheezing, and hypertension were particularly listed as being of interest, albeit the criteria for what constitutes an adverse medication response were not documented. Based on the age range mentioned, this research was done in a children's hospital, with one 20-year-old participant. The ages of the patients were not broken down further, however two of the individuals who had adverse medication responses were beyond the age of 13 [7].

In three trials that did not concentrate on children, 6 out of 70 patients (8.6%) suffered an acute response to CPIF [4, 8, and 9]. In two of these investigations, four individuals aged 13 or younger were enrolled, and none of them had an adverse response to CPIF [8, 9]. Patients in the third trial There was no additional break, and while 6/31 (19 percent) of the subjects. These people's ages were not mentioned, but they experienced an intense response to CPIF [4]. Four individuals had isolated urticaria, one had cough and urticaria, and the remaining patient had rashes, dyspnea, and wheezing [4].Various terminologies were employed, sometimes even in the same study, to refer to responses to CPIF, much as they were in children's research. The criteria for such responses were only published in one trial, and they were not very precise (any evident adverse event that occurs within 2 hours following CPIF injection) [4].

Limitations

The retrospective aspect of our research limits its ability to identify the existence based on data from an **electronic health records showing a severe** hypersensitive reaction despite utilising we were unable to obtain the kappa ratio for inter-rater consistency using various trained data abstractors, casting doubt on the consistency in our data extraction. Finally, despite the fact that our sample size was small, is bigger than that of previous research, it is still small; limiting the results derived for relatively uncommon occurrences such acute hypersensitivity responses to CPIF.

Conclusion

There were no patients who met our criteria for an acute hypersensitivity response. Given the different words employed and the absence of which was before criteria in many research, comparing the incidence of acute hypersensitivity responses in our study from others is difficult. Despite the differences in criteria, our results are consistent with previous research that found no CPIF may cause fast hypersensitivity, allergic, or other responses. Because it's doubtful that No patient should ever have a severe hypersensitive reaction to this antitoxin (or any drug for that matter); the real rate is most likely somewhere between two trials' findings of 7% and 19%.

REFERENCE:

1. Crofab [Package Insert]. West Conshohocken, PA: BTG International Inc.; March 2012.
2. Anavip [Package Insert]. Mexico D.F., Mexico: Instituto Bioclon S.A. de CV. May 2015.
3. Seifert SA, Boyer LV, Benson BE, Rogers JJ. AAPCC database characterization of native US venomous snake exposures, 2001– 2005. Clin Toxicol. 2009; 47(4):327–35.
4. Dart RC, Seifert SA, Boyer LV, Clark RF, Hall E, McKinney P, et al. A randomized multicenter trial of crotaline polyvalent immune Fab (ovine) antivenom for the treatment for crotaline snakebite in the United States. Arch Intern Med. 2001; 161: 2030–6.
5. Pizon AF, Riley BD, LoVecchio F, Gill R. Safety and efficacy of Crotalidae Polyvalent Immune Fab in pediatric crotaline envenomations. Acad Emerg Med. 2007; 14(4):373–6.
6. Offerman SR, Bush SP, Moynihand JA, Clark RF. Crotaline Fab antivenom for the treatment of children with rattlesnake envenoms- ation. Pediatrics. 2002; 110:968–71.
7. Farrar HC, Grayham T, Bolden B, Vyas D, Graham J, James LP. The use and tolerability of crotalidae polyvalent

immune FAB (ovine) in pediatric envenomations. Clin Pediatr. 2012; 51(10):945–9.
8. Ruha AM, Curry SC, Beuhler M, Katz K, Brooks DE, Graeme KA, et al. Initial postmarketing experience with crotalidae polyvalent im- mune Fab for treatment of rattlesnake envenomation. Ann Emerg Med. 2002; 39:609–15.
9. Dart RC, Seifert SA, Carroll L, Clark RF, Hall E, Boyer-Hassen LV, et al. Affinity-purified, mixed monospecific crotalid antivenom ovine Fab for the treatment of crotalid venom poisoning. Ann Emerg Med.1997; 30:33–9.