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Abstract

Background: Patients with a history of beta-lactam antibiotic allergy are often admitted to the hospital with severe or life-threatening infections requiring beta-lactam antibiotics. Strict avoidance of beta lactams to such patients may prevent them from getting adequate coverage and can lead to an increase in the use of alternative antibiotics, which can predispose to antibiotic resistance. Past studies revealed a lower incidence of pen allergy then patients' histories suggest. Fortunately today, there are three options for patients presenting with a history of beta-lactam allergy. Penicillin skin testing, beta-lactam challenge or beta-lactam desensitization.

Recently Pre Pen has been FDA re-approved and when combined with Pen G is a valid way to determine if patients are able to tolerate beta-lactam antibiotic. When these agents are not available one must decide about desensitization or challenge. When a patient has a positive penicillin skin test, desensitization or beta-lactam avoidance are the only options.

This paper reviews the safety of beta-lactam desensitization.

Objective: To perform a chart review on patients desensitised with beta lactam to determine if desensitizations can be performed safely without minimal complications.

Methods: A retrospective chart review was performed on allergy and immunology inpatient consultations for beta-lactam desensitization between September 2003 and August 2006 at the Cedars-Sinai Medical Centre in Los Angeles. Patient data and outcomes of desensitization were analysed.

Results: A total of 13 intravenous desensitizations were performed on 12 patients. The patients consisted of eight females and four males with an average age of 65 years. Age range was 36–92 years old. All 13 intravenous desensitizations were completed without complications. No patient required a slower rate of desensitization or discontinuance of the desensitization. Patients were able to tolerate the initial therapeutic dose of their beta-lactam antibiotic and were then able to complete full therapeutic courses of their antibiotic.
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Introduction

Beta-lactam antibiotics include the penicillin (PCN), cephalosporin, carbapenem and monobactam categories. When patients require these antibiotics for infection, avoidance of this large group of antibiotics is a challenge. In addition, many patients have drug resistant infections and do not have many antibiotic choices. For example, extended spectrum beta lactame (ESBL) infections have only carbapenems as their treatment option. Currently, many physicians would avoid all beta-lactams including carbapenems in PCN allergic patients. This would leave patients with ESBL infections without a treatment option.

Patients with a clinical history of penicillin allergy upon hospitalization are much more likely to receive alternative antibiotics such as vancomycin and fluoroquinolones.

This may contribute to an increase in vancomycin-resistant enterococci and fluoroquinolone-resistant pseudomonas. Excluding the monobactam category, all of the beta-lactam antibiotics share a common bicyclic core structure, the beta-lactam ring that is thought to be the basis for the cross-reactivity. The risk of cross reaction of these groups of antibiotics has a varied rate in the literature. According to studies, PCNs and cephalosporins have a cross-reactivity rate between 1 and 8% with first and second generations of cephalosporins having a higher rate. PCN and the monobactam aztreonam have no significant cross reactivity likely due to the fact that aztreonam has a monocyclic core structure. Aztreonam may have some cross reactivity to ceftazidine since they share a similar side chain. Data have shown some cross reaction among penicillin and amoxicillin and certain cephalosporins with similar side chains. Cross reactions among cephalosporins may also occur due to these side chains. Finally, studies show conflicting data in the cross reactivity of PCNs and the carbapenems. Early studies have reported a higher rate of cross reaction up to 47%, further studies have shown a much lower rate of 5–9% or an even lower rate that is described as minimal. The exact rate of cross reaction between PCN and carbapenems is unknown.

Many patients have a history of penicillin allergy. Up to 10% of hospitalized patients report an allergy to PCN. However, many patients have only a vague history of PCN allergy or they report adverse effects mistakenly as an allergy.

Retrospective and prospective studies have shown a significant false-positive rate for self-reported penicillin allergy. Studies also show many patients lose their PCN allergy with only 30% maintaining their positive skin test at 10 years. Therefore it can be difficult to determine whether a patient is truly PCN allergic or not based solely on history.

Typical symptoms of PCN IgE-mediated allergic reaction include skin reactions, urticaria, angioedema, laryngeal edema, bronchospasm, and hypotension/shock. A thorough history can help differentiate adverse effects versus an IgE-mediated reaction.

It is also important to determine if a patient suffered from a hypersensitivity (IgE) reaction vs. another immunologic cellular reaction such as SJS/TENS. Patients presenting with a history of beta-lactam antibiotics causing blisters and burns may have experienced SJS or TENS life-threatening conditions where cell death leads to the separation of epidermis from the dermous. Beta-lactam skin testing or desensitization is contraindicated in these patients.

Methods

Inpatient allergy and immunology consultations for beta-lactam desensitization between September 2003 and August 2006 at Cedars-Sinai Medical Centre in Los Angeles. Institutional Review Board approval was obtained. The allergy clinic received a total of 13 consultations for possible antibiotic desensitization of this period of time. All patients had a history consistent with beta-lactam allergy and had a serious infection requiring a beta-lactam antibiotic as their only treatment option. No PCN skin testing was performed, due to unavailability of the reagents at the time of admission.

All patients were evaluated and referred by an infectious disease physician to a specific allergist/immunologist. All patients were evaluated and treated by the same allergist. No patients had a history of Steven-Johnson syndrome, toxic epidermal necrolysis, or penicillin-induced exfoliative dermatitis. Data collected included age, gender, admitting diagnosis, beta-lactam allergy history, desensitization complications and outcome.

Patients were transferred to the intensive care unit for increased observation and for immediate access to

| Table 1 Premedication given to patients 1h prior to desensitization. |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| Medication               | Dose 1h before desensitization |
| Ranitidine               | 50 mg IV or 150 mg po |
| Diphenhydramine          | 25 mg po or IV |
| Monteleukast             | 10 mg po |
| Cetirizine or Loratadine | 10 mg po |
emergency treatment if necessary. Patients were pre-
memedicated 1 h before starting desensitization with 
the medications listed in Table 1. Beta-blocker medica-
tion was discontinued for at least 24 h. All patients 
were informed of the risks/benefits of desensitization 
and consent forms were signed. Documentation was 
made in the patient’s chart regarding the need for a 
beta-lactam antibiotic by the patient’s primary care/critical 
care and infectious disease physicians.

Desensitization occurred at 15 min time intervals. Doses 
started at 0.1 mg and were doubled at each interval until 
therapeutic doses were achieved (Table 2). Doses were 
infused intravenously in 50 cc of normal saline over 
30 min. Medication was dispensed and mixed by the hospital 
pharmacy and the medication was administered by critical care 
nurses. The final antibiotic therapeutic dose and frequency 
was determined by the patient’s infectious disease physi-
cian (Table 3). A physician was on premises at all times, 
but not at the patient’s bedside. The patient’s vital signs 
were monitored continuously including monitoring for an-
aphylaxis such as hypotension, tachycardia, and dyspnoea. 
Also every 15 min the patient was observed for signs of aller-
gic reaction including pruritus, rash or flushing, urticaria, 
angioedema, and wheezing. If flushing, a rash, or urticaria 
developed, a slower protocol of desensitization was to be 
used, and desensitization was to be stopped for angioedema, 
changes in respiratory status, or hypotension. Treatment for 
potential anaphylaxis was immediately available at bedside 
(Table 4).

**Results**

Thirteen intravenous desensitizations were completed on 
12 patients; one patient was desensitised twice during 
different hospitalizations. Eight imipenem desensitizations, 
three penicillin desensitizations, and two cephalosporin 
desensitizations were performed. The patients consisted of 
eight females and four males with an average age of 65 
years. Age range was 36–92 years old. No patients had a 
history of allergic rhinitis, asthma, or other atopic disease. 
Seven patients reported multiple drug allergies in addition 
to their beta-lactam allergy including sulfonamides, 
quinolones, tetracyclines, macrolides, telithromycin, 
vancomycin, terbinafine, cortisone, and iron.

All 13 intravenous desensitizations were completed 
without complications. No patients required a slower 
desensitization protocol or discontinuation of their desensi-
tization. Patients were able to tolerate the therapeutic dose 
of their beta-lactam antibiotic and were able to complete 
full therapeutic courses of their antibiotic. No patient had a 
lapse in their treatment. Two patients after the desensi-
tization, died later during their hospital course at a sufficient 
time after the desensitization. To conclude, their deaths 
were due to their underlying infection and were unrelated 
to the desensitization.

**Discussion**

In beta-lactam allergic patients, desensitization is a proce-
dure that can lead to decreased antibiotic restrictions by 
allowing the use of beta-lactam antibiotics. The mechanism 
of desensitization is unclear but is thought to be due to 
antigen-specific mast cell desensitization. Desensitization is 
only used in type-1 hypersensitivity reactions, those that are 
immediate and IgE-mediated. Desensitization is generally 
successful, in a retrospective review of 57 cases, 75% had 
successful desensitizations. Of the 11 cases in this review 
where desensitization failed due to allergic reactions, seven 
of the allergic reactions were not solely IgE-mediated. In 
another study, up to 30% of 26 patients had adverse effects 
such as pruritus and urticaria, but all patients were still able 
to tolerate complete desensitization. Our experience with 
13 inpatient beta-lactam desensitizations had a decreased 
rate of adverse effects, possibly due to the smaller number 
of patients.

Our success in desensitization and lack of adverse effects 
raises the question that perhaps our patients were not beta-
lactam allergic, had lost their beta-lactam allergy over time, 
or did not have an allergic cross-reactivity to their desensi-
tised antibiotic.

Due to the lack of penicillin skin testing at the time of 
these patient admissions and due to the risk of possible an-
aphylaxis and/or death, desensitising these patients with a 
life-threatening infection with a beta-lactam allergy history 
was deemed necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Past history</th>
<th>Allergy</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Desensitization</th>
<th>Complication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Urosepsis, Pneumonia Neurosyphilis</td>
<td>HTN, CAD, CHF, CVA, Renal failure, CAD, hypothyroidism, dementia, HTN</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Rash</td>
<td>Imipenem</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Neurosyphilis</td>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Neurosyphilis</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Urosepsis</td>
<td>Diabetes, TIAs, hypothyroidism, chf</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Pneumonia</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Angioedema</td>
<td>Cefepime</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Pneumonia, Urosepsis</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Rash</td>
<td>Imipenem</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Bacteraemia</td>
<td>Diabetes, DVT, PE, SLE, COPD, HIV</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Vomiting, Dyspnoea, Urticaria,</td>
<td>Imipenem</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Endocarditis</td>
<td>PCN, CS</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Urticaria,</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Pneumonia, Sepsis</td>
<td>GERD, HTN</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Urticaria,</td>
<td>Imipenem</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Soft tissue infection right foot</td>
<td>RA/vasculitis, hypothyroidism DVT, rheumatoid lung</td>
<td>PCN, CS</td>
<td>Urticaria, Weezing</td>
<td>Imipenem</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Sepsis</td>
<td>Breast CA, nonhodgkins lymphoma, DVT, chronic renal disease</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Imipenem</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Sepsis</td>
<td>Breast CA, nonhodgkins lymphoma, DVT, chronic renal disease</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Imipenem</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (repeat)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Sepsis</td>
<td>Breast CA, nonhodgkins lymphoma, DVT, chronic renal disease</td>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Imipenem</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PCN, penicillin; CS, cephalosporin; F, female; M, male.
Skin testing with antibiotics other than PCN is not standardised, the negative predictive value of these skin tests is unknown, and the positive predictive value is unknown. Also, many of the beta-lactam antibiotics have metabolites that are major causes of allergic reactions. For example, in carbapenems the metabolised component of the drug is unavailable for skin testing and is a main trigger in immediate hypersensitivity reactions. Skin testing without the metabolised component could cause a false negative skin test.

In vitro tests for beta-lactam allergy are commercially available for PCN G, PCN V, ampicillin, amoxicillin and the second generation cephalosporin Cefaclor. These allergen specific IgE assays include the radioallergosorbert test (RAST) and ImmunoCap assay. Currently, using penicillin specific IgE assays to rule out a penicillin allergy is not recommended. However, a positive RAST or ImmunoCap test could be indicative of the presence of IgE antibodies and the patient would require desensitization of the needed antibiotic. RAST/ImmunoCap testing has been shown to have a high specificity but unfortunately a low sensitivity compared to skin testing.15,16 Also, RAST testing has been shown in one study to only test for the major determinant.15 A more recent study failed to show the IgE antipenicillin fluorometric enzyme immunoassay as being useful in patients with remote histories of penicillin allergy.17 Thus, in vitro testing has significant limitations in determining true allergy.

The current commercial anti-penicillin IgE FEIAs are not useful in diagnosing penicillin allergy in patients with remote histories of penicillin allergy. Penicillin skin testing and, if the results are negative, an oral challenge remain the criterion standard tests to determine therapeutic penicillin tolerance.

Skin testing is clearly the preferred test for PCN allergy and has a negative predictive value of approximately 99% and a positive predictive value of 40–60%.18–21 In the early 1970s the major determinant to penicillin, termed pre pen was marketed. In the mid 2000s, pre pen was not available although recently Pre Pen has been re-approved and is currently available. Penicillin when metabolised consists of major determinants, which are usually responsible for less severe hypersensitivity reactions and minor determinants which are responsible for 20% of the more severe reactions.22 It is best to use both a minor and a major determinant for skin testing. Pen G has been found to contain these minor determinants.13

An important point to consider in desensitization is cost. Desensitization increases patient care costs by requiring ICU space as well as increased monitoring and nursing, physician, and pharmacist time.

This is why it is important to have skin testing with Pre Pen and Pen G available at facilities and to use desensitization when penicillin skin testing is positive. The above study along with others does show that desensitization is tolerated in the majority of patients. It would be worth determining the safety of pen desensitization in only pen positive patients now that skin testing is available.

Overall, Beta-lactam antibiotic allergies present a challenging problem for physicians. Patients with drug resistant infections whose antibiotic choice is limited may need desensitization. Desensitization is a choice of last resort given its associated cost and risk of anaphylaxis. Desensitization should be performed in the ICU setting for increased monitoring and should be performed by an experienced clinician. Once desensitization has been performed, patients may be able to tolerate full doses of antibiotics for the full length of treatment for their infection with minimal side effects.

Now that pen skin testing available, desensitization should be only required for patients who have positive penicillin skin tests. Future studies will be able to determine the safety/success in desensitization with skin test positive patients.
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