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Therapeutic controversies in the management of acute anaphylaxis

Anthony F T Brown

At present there are few controlled clinical therapeutic trials in acute anaphylaxis despite the emergence of evidence based medicine. Moreover, the explosive nature, unpredictable onset, and usually rapid response to treatment that characterise acute anaphylaxis mean that this situation is unlikely to change. The vast majority of serious anaphylactic reactions occur unexpectedly, typically in fit patients. Anaphylaxis is rarely seen or described in critically ill or shocked patients other than in those with asthma. Therefore, treatment recommendations have to be based on clinical observation, interpretation of the pathophysiology and, to an extent, animal studies. However, descriptions of the management of anaphylaxis, for instance those in Hospital Update in 1991 and on angio-oedema in the British Medical Journal in 1992, are often then criticised for the treatment recommended. A recent expert opinion by Fisher on the treatment of acute anaphylaxis10 was followed by no less than 10 letters in response, many of which contained errors of logic as pointed out by Fisher in replying to them.11

Clearly there is confusion about the correct management of acute anaphylaxis. Much of the controversy is due to misinterpretation of published reports. In this review I reassess the role, route of delivery, dose, concentration, and efficacy of the various drugs used in anaphylaxis. Adrenaline, steroids, antihistamines, fluids, glucagon, aminophylline, and discharge drugs will be discussed in detail. I shall use the term “anaphylaxis” to refer to both anaphylactic reactions (IgE mediated immediate type hypersensitivity reactions) and anaphylactoid reactions (non-immunologically triggered), as the clinical expression and final mediators involved are identical.12 Tables are included giving clear recommendations for first line, second line, and discharge treatment, and allowing rapid evaluation of the drugs involved.

Adrenaline

Beneficial effects

Adrenaline has a pivotal role as first line treatment for acute anaphylaxis. Its beneficial effects include α adrenergic stimulation increasing peripheral vascular resistance and improving the blood pressure and coronary artery perfusion, reversing peripheral vasodilatation, and decreasing angio-oedema and urticaria. β1 Adrenergic stimulation has positive inotropic and chronotropic effects on cardiac activity, and β2 adrenergic effects include bronchodilatation. Adrenergic receptors also increase intracellular cyclic adenosine monophosphate (cAMP) production in mast cells and basophils, which inhibits further inflammatory mediator release (table 1).

Routes of administration

However, the correct dose and route of administration of adrenaline are unclear. The British national formulary recommends 0.5 to 1.0 ml or 0.5 to 1.0 ml of 1:1000 adrenaline intramuscularly as the standard initial adrenaline regime in anaphylaxis.3 In America, 0.3 to 0.5 mg of 1:1000 adrenaline subcutaneously is recommended,2 whereas 0.5 to 0.8 mg subcutaneously is recommended in Sweden.3 The clinical effectiveness of these dose variations is not well defined, nor is there convincing evidence for a difference between the intramuscular and subcutaneous routes. As vasodilatation is the main pathological change early in anaphylaxis, the subcutaneous or intramuscular absorption of adrenaline is rapid and effective. When anaphylaxis is treated early, is mild or progressing slowly, when venous access is difficult, or if the patient is unmonitored, 0.3 to 0.5 ml of 1:1000 adrenaline (0.3 to 0.5 mg) should be given intramuscularly. This has advantages in terms of safety and is usually highly effective.3 The adrenaline dose may be repeated every five to 10 minutes, or longer according to the response (table 2).

Table 1 Beneficial effects of adrenaline

| a Adrenergic | ↑ Peripheral vascular resistance: | ↑ Blood pressure: | ↑ Coronary artery perfusion |
| ↓ Peripheral vasodilatation | ↓ Angio-oedema | ↓ Urticaria |
| β, Adrenergic | Positive inotrope | Positive chronotrope |
| β, Adrenergic | Bronchodilatation |
| β Adrenergic | cAMP production: | ↓ Inflammatory mediator release |

Intravenous adrenaline

In more serious cases of anaphylaxis, particularly when the intravascular volume is depleted and shock occurs, or there is severe dyspnoea or airway compromise, the intravenous route is necessary to achieve the rapid, optimal absorption of adrenaline. Relying on the subcutaneous route in these circumstances is unsatisfactory. Heilborn showed in 12 healthy adult
Table 2  First line management of acute anaphylaxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxygen</th>
<th>Adrenaline Early, mild, or progressing slowly, difficult venous access, or unmonitored patient:</th>
<th>0.3–0.5 mg (0.3–0.5 mL) of 1:1000 adrenaline IM, repeated every 5–10 min according to response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shock, severe dyspnoea, airway compromise, or deteriorating patient. Must be monitored:</td>
<td>0.75–1.5 µg/kg of 1:1000 adrenaline IV at 10–20 µg/min (1–2 mL/min) initially, repeated according to response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10–20 mL/kg for shock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Colloid         | IM, intramuscular; IV, intravenous.                                                                 |                                                                                                    |

subjects that the subcutaneous administration of adrenaline leads to prolonged but variable absorption related to local vasoconstrictor action. This potential for variability is clearly unacceptable in the shocked or critically compromised patient.

Unfortunately, the use of intravenous adrenaline in anaphylaxis is confused by an even wider variation in proposed doses, ranging from 1 µg/min to a 2 mg bolus. Moreover, many clinicians warn that intravenous adrenaline is too dangerous and rarely if ever justified, as it may cause greatly increased systolic and diastolic blood pressures with the risks of intracerebral bleeding, increased myocardial oxygen consumption inducing angina, myocardial ischaemia or even infarction, and cardiac arrhythmias including ventricular fibrillation. However, these adverse outcomes usually occur when the adrenaline has been given too rapidly, inadequately diluted, or in excessive dose.

Cases cited from published reports on the apparent dangers of intravenous adrenaline fail to emphasise clearly that other causes such as hypoxia, hypotension, acidosis, or the direct action of the inflammatory mediators released during anaphylaxis may be responsible for the cardiovascular complications. For instance, Sullivan described two patients with anaphylaxis given a bolus intravenous injection of 500 µg (5 mL) of 1:10 000 adrenaline by paramedics before arrival at hospital. Both patients developed ventricular tachycardia which reverted spontaneously to sinus rhythm. Sullivan concluded that physicians treating anaphylaxis should be aware of possible arrhythmias—spontaneous, adrenaline induced, or from other causes—and that ECG monitoring was desirable.

Robert-Thomson et al stated in a letter to the *Medical Journal of Australia* that one patient had a cardiac arrest following intravenous adrenaline for moderate anaphylaxis, so its administration was hazardous and rarely warranted, but they pointed out that if intravenous adrenaline is required it should be given slowly and in high dilution. Finally, Barach et al describe a 34 year old man stung by a bee who received 500 µg (0.5 mL) of 1:1000 adrenaline intravenously over three minutes. He initially developed chest pain, palpitations, and ST elevation on the ECG, and was subsequently diagnosed as having had a myocardial infarct related to multiple small vessel disease 24 days later.

In their discussion, they questioned whether agents other than adrenaline may have caused the initial myocardial ischaemia, such as the direct cardiotoxic effect of melittin in hymenopteran venom. Also, they noted that many of the mediators released in anaphylaxis themselves cause coronary artery vasoconstriction, including histamine (through H1 receptors), platelet activating factor (PAF), leukotrienes, thromboxane A2, and prostaglandin D2. Finally, they discuss the benefits of adrenaline and the confusion over dose guidelines, and recommend that in anaphylactic shock adrenaline should be given intravenously in a dilution of 1:100 000 delivered at 1 mL or 10 µg per minute initially, under ECG monitoring.

Thus all three papers discuss important safety issues in the use of intravenous adrenaline and suggest other possible causes for the cardiovascular complications. Unfortunately, these reports are now usually cited as being critical of the use of intravenous adrenaline and as incorrectly implicating it as the sole cause of cardiovascular complications.

---

Table 3  Potential side effects of adrenaline

| Greatly increased systolic and diastolic blood pressure: | ↑ Risk of intracerebral bleeding |
| Myocardial oxygen consumption: | ↑ Angina, myocardial ischaemia |
| Cardiac arrhythmias | ↑ Risk of myocardial infarction |

1:100 000 DILUTION OF INTRAVENOUS ADRENALINE

Many experts currently recommend a similar dilution and dose of intravenous adrenaline to Barach and Nowak for serious anaphylaxis. They recommend adrenaline diluted to 1:100 000 given at 1–2 mL (10–20 µg) per minute at an initial dose of 0.75–1.5 µg/kg. This may be followed by an infusion if prolonged treatment is required.

“Serious anaphylaxis” includes any patient with hypotension, severe bronchospasm or airway swelling, or deteriorating despite intramuscular adrenaline. Intravenous adrenaline used in this way is logical, safe, and essential, provided it is given in a resuscitation area under ECG monitoring. The 1:100 000 adrenaline is prepared by drawing up 1 mg adrenaline (1 mL of 1:1000 adrenaline) in a 20 mL syringe, and 9 mL saline to give a total volume of 10 mL. All but 2 mL of this is discarded (leaving 200 µg of adrenaline in the syringe). Saline is again drawn up to a total volume of 20 mL, giving a final concentration of 10 µg per mL—that is, a 1:1000 dilution. Alternatively, an infusion of adrenaline may be prepared by putting 1 mg adrenaline in 100 mL normal saline, and running at 60–120 mL/hour using an infusion device (that is, 10–20 µg/min). The rate may be altered or the infusion stopped according to the clinical response. Patients with persistent symptoms...
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may require a maintenance infusion at 1–5 μg/min before admission to intensive care. This low dose, high dilution adrenaline regime with its minimal cardiac side effects is entirely consistent with pharmacokinetic data in Goodman and Gilman’s *The pharmacological basis of therapeutics.*

POSTADRENALINE CARE

Patients with significant anaphylactic reactions, including all those who received adrenaline, should be admitted to a monitored observation area (table 4). If their condition remains unstable, this should be an intensive care unit. Patients who are stable and appear to have recovered should still be observed for at least six to eight hours, as late deterioration may occur. This so called biphasic response was observed in up to 20% of the 25 patients in Stark and Sullivan’s original description in 1986, but more recent data on biphasic systemic anaphylaxis in an inpatient and outpatient study involving 94 patients by Douglas et al showed a much lower incidence of around 5%.

It is essential to refer for allergy testing all patients discharged following a significant episode of anaphylaxis, to determine the cause of the reaction. This may include cutaneous testing and radioimmunoassays for specific IgE. Desensitisation programmes may then be appropriate for selected patients. Others may require a self treatment adrenaline regime to avert or modify a serious attack should prodromal symptoms be experienced in the future.

Those prescribed adrenaline by injection for self use (for example, Min-I-Jet or Epipen) must be fully trained in its use, as must their families. An alternative method of prehospital adrenaline delivery is high dose inhaled adrenaline by metered dose aerosol. Twenty 150 μg activations of Medihaler-epi act rapidly and predictably to achieve both a high local and therapeutic systemic adrenaline level. Careful instruction in optimum inhaler technique is important.

Steroids

**BENEFICIAL EFFECTS**

The role of steroids in the management of acute anaphylaxis is limited to the prevention or shortening of protracted reactions, particularly those associated with bronchospasm. This is despite their many theoretical benefits, which include an increase in tissue responsiveness to β adrenergic agonists, inhibition of mediator release at three possible sites (by inhibition of phospholipase A₂, glutathione-s-transferase, and degranulation—possibly involving uncoupling of receptor-effector systems), downregulating cell activation, prevention of neutrophil and platelet aggregation, and decreasing IgE receptor expression. (table 5). Even if given intravenously, steroids may take up to four to six hours to be maximally effective.

**SIDE EFFECTS**

However, there are significant side effects reported with the use of steroids, such as steroid induced myopathy, sodium and potassium ion flux changes, and acute perineal pain with hydrocortisone sodium phosphate injection. Moreover, parenteral methylprednisolone, hydrocortisone and betamethasone and oral dexamethasone have all caused systemic anaphylaxis themselves. Although this is rare, the mechanisms include hapten formation to elicit a reaction to an additive such as metabisulphite. Even more rare and unusual complications include coronary artery spasm following intramuscular betamethasone and sudden death or myocardial ischaemia following rapid infusion of high doses of corticosteroids.

**INTRAVENOUS STEROIDS**

If intravenous steroids are used, standard doses of hydrocortisone of 5 mg/kg to a maximum of 200 mg, followed by 2.5 mg/kg six hourly, or methylprednisolone 125 mg six hourly are recommended. (table 7). There appears little justification for the higher doses of methylprednisolone—30 mg/kg—given in severe bronchospasm.

**ORAL STEROIDS**

Oral steroids, such as prednisone 40–50 mg daily, avoid many of the above mentioned problems with intravenous steroids and should be used in all but the sickest patients. Oral steroids also form the cornerstone of management of recurrent idiopathic anaphylaxis. Prednisone 60–100 mg orally daily, then alternate daily, and then tapered by no more than 5–10 mg per month is most effective in this rare condition. Prednisone 20 mg twice daily for four days is a safe and effective adjunct to H₁ blocking antihistamine drugs in shortening the symptomatic and clinical course of acute urticaria, and is usually included in discharge medication, as discussed at the end of this review.

**Antihistamines**

The role of antihistamines in the management of acute anaphylaxis, although widespread, is controversial. Antihistamines and steroids should never be relied upon alone as first line treatment. Underlying the use of antihistamines are several paradoxes, which add to the confusion.

---

**Table 4** Indications for admission in acute anaphylaxis

| Admit all patients with significant reactions, including any who received adrenaline. |
| If the patient is severely shocky, monitor arterial pressure and heart rate every 5 minutes. |
| If respiratory rate is more than 24/min, inject adrenaline intravenously. |
| If stable, administer adrenaline intravenously and intramuscularly. |
| If stable, admit to an intensive care unit. |
| If their condition remains unstable, this should be an intensive care unit. |
| Patients who are stable and appear to have recovered should still be observed for at least six to eight hours, as late deterioration may occur. |

---

**Table 5** Beneficial effects of steroids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tissue responsiveness to β adrenergic agonists</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator release</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibition of phospholipase A₂</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibition of glutathione-s-transferase</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncoupling of receptor-effector systems</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downregulate cell activation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent neutrophil and platelet aggregation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease IgE expression</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Table 6 Potential side effects of steroids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse effect</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steroid induced myopathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium and potassium ion flux changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphylaxis (parenteral methylprednisolone, hydrocortisone, betamethasone; oral dexamethasone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perineal pain (hydrocortisone sodium phosphate injection)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary artery spasm (intramuscular betamethasone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudden death or myocardial ischaemia (rapid, high dose infusion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARADOXES IN THE USE OF ANTIHISTAMINES

Histamine has a variety of effects, principally on the respiratory and cardiovascular system, which may be deleterious (predominantly H1 mediated) or potentially beneficial (predominantly H2 mediated), as listed in Table 8. The use of H1 receptor antagonists should therefore be associated with adverse effects as the H2 mediated beneficial effects are blocked. However, the opposite appears to be true. H1 receptor antihistamines such as cimetidine 300 mg intravenously are effective in refractory anaphylactic shock unresponsive to adrenaline, fluids, steroids, and H2 receptor antihistamine given intravenously.52-53 Effects other than direct myocardial histamine receptor interaction must be operating, and the intense vasodilatation seen is clearly mediated by both H1 receptors and H2 receptors.53-55 Also, although pruritus is said to be H1 receptor mediated,56 H2 receptor blockers alone have proved effective clinically in relieving itching and wheal development,57 and in one series were more effective than H1 receptor blockers in the treatment of acute urticaria.51

COMBINED H1 AND H2 RECEPTOR BLOCKER USE

Thus the consensus regarding the use of antihistamines in acute anaphylaxis now favours a combination of an H1 and an H2 receptor blocker.23 44 57 Lieberman57 states that for the prevention of drug induced anaphylactic and anaphylactoid reactions, combined H1 and H2 receptor blockade is more effective than H1 blockade alone; physiological rationale and a series of case reports indicate that combined H1 and H2 receptor blockade should also be more effective than H1 blockade alone in the treatment of anaphylaxis. Lorenz also showed superior efficacy of combined H1 and H2 receptor blockers in protecting against histamine related cardiorespiratory disturbances during routine anaesthesia.58

Table 7 Second line management of acute anaphylaxis (oxygen, adrenaline, and fluids are given first)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Dosage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antihistamines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 receptor blocker diphenhydramine</td>
<td>25–50 mg IV or promethazine 12.5–25 mg IV, plus H1 receptor blocker cimetidine 300 mg IV slowly or ranitidine 50 mg IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat above 6 hourly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to oral when patient tolerates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diphenhydramine 25 mg orally 8 hourly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or promethazine 10 mg orally 8 hourly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus cimetidine 400 mg orally 12 hourly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or ranitidine 150 mg orally 12 hourly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steroids (definitely given for severe bronchospasm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocortisone 5 mg/kg IV to maximum 200 mg, then 2.5 mg/kg IV 6 hourly or methylprednisolone 125 mg IV 6 hourly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to oral when patient tolerates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prednisolone 40–50 mg orally per day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glucagon (especially if patient on β blockers)</td>
<td>1 mg IV every 5 min, then infusion at 5–15 μg/min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aminophylline (refractory bronchospasm)</td>
<td>5–6 mg/kg IV over 30 min as loading dose; then infusion at 0.5 mg/kg/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIDE EFFECTS AND LIMITATIONS

Antihistamines never have a central role in the management of anaphylaxis since the concentration of histamine in the immediate vicinity of a mast cell after degranulation is so great that by the time anaphylaxis is diagnosed, it is too late for a competitive blocker to be of value. Furthermore, antihistamines do not actually prevent mediator release, and mediators other than histamine are of equal biological importance.59 In addition, there are important side effects related to the use of H1 receptor antihistamines, such as sedation, hypertension from a β adrenergic blockade, confusion, and torsade de pointes, particularly if astemizole or terfenadine are combined with erythromycin.60 The risks of sedation are particularly relevant during outpatient treatment. Patients must be warned not to drive or operate machinery, especially if prescribed H1 receptor blockers (and to a much lesser extent H2 receptor blockers)51 (table 9).

OPTIMAL ROLE OF ANTIHISTAMINES

Antihistamines are of greatest use when the allergic condition is not life threatening and is progressing slowly, such as in angio-oedema and urticaria.33 The half life of angio-oedema may be longer than the duration of effect of any adrenaline given, and hence it may recur if treatment is not supplemented with antihistamines.66 Although acute urticaria may be self limited if untreated,67 most patients who present to hospital have disabling symptoms. H1 receptor blockers alone have traditionally been considered the primary treatment,68 but should now be given in combination with an H2 blocker (table 7).69 Subcutaneous adrenaline has also been recommended for itching and urticaria in milder forms of anaphylaxis,61 although it should be used in conjunction with antihistamines.64 Finally steroids should be added in acute urticaria, particularly in refractory cases. Doses of 20 mg prednisone orally twice daily are safe and effective.69

Fluids

Over half the people who die from anaphylaxis succumb within the first hour.14 The principal causes of death in 75% of cases are asphyxia from upper airway oedema and hypoxia from severe bronchospasm. Death in the remaining 25% is related to respiratory failure with hypotension.65 This hypotension is multifactorial, but includes plasma losses of up to 50% of the circulatory volume.1 Therefore fluids, with oxygen and adrenaline, are essential first line treatment for severe anaphylaxis with shock.12

WHICH FLUID?

Crystalloid solutions such as normal saline or Ringer’s lactate may be given rapidly at 10–20 ml/kg/hr. Alternatively, colloids including albumin, dextan 70, and gelatin preparations such as Haemaccel may be given, also at 10–20 ml/kg.60 65 66 Large volumes of fluid are often required. Measurement of central venous pressure and packed cell volume help guide treatment. Although both solutions have been used successfully, the three- to sixfold extra
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Table 8 Deleterious and potentially beneficial histamine receptor effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H₁ receptor:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arrhythmia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary vasodilation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial fall in blood pressure (with an infusion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronchospasm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pruritus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ receptor:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary vasodilation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive inotrope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive chronotrope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronchodilatation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained hypertension (with an infusion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative feedback inhibition histamine release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

requirement with crystalloids, their dilution of colloid oncotic pressure, and the longer lasting capillary leakage which prolongs resuscitation are factors favouring the use of colloids in anaphylactic shock (table 2).

FLUID USE ALONE

Some authorities have used fluids alone in anaphylactic shock,77 without vasoconstrictor drugs, for instance following reactions to contrast media administration, and question the central role of adrenaline.68 Others have found the opposite and have been unable to resuscitate patients with fluid alone.69 There are compelling arguments against using fluid alone, such as the additional benefit of adrenaline in bronchospasm, urticaria, and angioedema, its ability to stabilise mast cells, reducing further mediator release, and the rapidity of its administration intramuscularly or subcutaneously, when intravenous access is difficult or delayed.1

CONCERNS WITH HAEMACCEL

A concern over the use of colloids, particularly polygeline (Haemaccel), is that this preparation itself is known to have caused anaphylactic reactions. Anaphylaxis has been reported rarely following the use of Haemaccel during general anaesthesia69 and epidural anaesthesia,70 although the exact mechanism is unclear. The makers claim that following modification of the manufacturing process Haemaccel is now non-antigenic and that possible anaphylactoid reactions may be minimised by pretreatment with combined H₁ and H₂ histamine receptor blockers71 (as confirmed by Lorenz72). They also advise against rapid infusion to normovolaemic individuals. In practice, although various colloids may produce anaphylactoid and anaphylactoid reactions, these rarely if ever occur in already shocked patients, presumably because of the protective effects of their own sympathoadrenal response to the shock.35 41

Glucagon

Patients taking β blocking drugs appear to be at increased risk of anaphylaxis and have more severe reactions that prove difficult to treat.73 74 Standard treatment with adrenergic agents may be ineffectual and theoretically causes a predominance of unopposed α adrenergic effects leading to augmented mediator release, bradycardia, bronchoconstriction, and dangerously exaggerated systemic pressor effects.75 Although aggressive management with adrenaline, fluids, dopamine, and isoproterenol may work, many authorities recommend using glucagon, particularly for refractory hypotension.13 24 47 63 Glucagon in a dose of 1 mg intravenously repeated every five minutes, followed by an infusion at 5–15 μg/min, raises intracellular cyclic AMP by a calcium dependent stimulation which does not involve β adrenergic receptors, causing positive inotropic and chronotropic cardiac effects.76 It is necessary to be careful with its use because nausea, vomiting, dizziness, hypokalaemia, and blood sugar abnormalities may occur39 40 (table 7).

Aminophylline

Aminophylline may be useful for severe anaphylactic bronchospasm resistant to adrenaline and steroids. Although considered dangerous by some, the combination of aminophylline and adrenaline produces no greater incidence of serious arrhythmias such as ventricular fibrillation than would be expected with either drug used alone.77 It was used safely in over 200 cases in one series without mishap, with apparent improvement in most patients.78

BENEFICIAL EFFECTS AND DOSE

Beneficial effects include bronchodilatation, stimulation of respiratory muscles, pulmonary vasodilatation, and a rise in intracellular cyclic AMP through inhibition of phosphodiesterase, theoretically adding to the inhibiting effect of adrenaline on mediator release.30 However, it should be avoided in anaphylactic shock as worsening of hypotension and unpredictable cardiac toxicity occur.2

The recommended dose is 5–6 mg/kg intravenously over 30 minutes, with full cardiac monitoring. A lower infusion rate is used in older patients, in those taking drugs that interfere with aminophylline metabolism such as cimetidine or erythromycin, and in patients with liver or cardiac failure. Higher rates may be used in fit, younger patients and cigarette smokers.7 Nebulised salbutamol may be used in addition for bronchospasm2 10 30 (table 7).

Discharge planning

PERIOD OF OBSERVATION

All patients with significant anaphylactic reactions, including those who received adrenaline, should be observed for a minimum of six to eight hours after apparent recovery, as late deterioration may occur.33 34 Patients with unstable vital signs or with protracted or resistant anaphylaxis should be monitored in an intensive care area. Others who remain well may then be discharged if no further symptoms recur, as discussed earlier (table 4).

Table 9 Potential side effects of antihistamines

| Sedation (H₁ > H₂) |  |
| Hypotension (β blockade) |  |
| Confusion |  |
| Torsade de pointes (especially astemizole or terfenadine plus erythromycin) |  |
DISCHARGE DRUGS AND ALLERGY REFERRAL

Drug treatment should be continued for three days after hospital discharge.23 24 47 Oral antihistamines such as the H1 receptor blocker diphenhydramine 25 mg eight hourly and an H2 receptor blocker such as cimetidine 400 mg 12 hourly are suitable. Although some physicians prefer to use one or the other—choosing an H2 receptor blocker to avoid drowsiness in those patients wishing to drive or return to work48—it is logical to give both together.55 Oral prednisone 40–50 mg daily is recommended in addition, to reduce the likelihood of relapse of symptoms25 26 and to augment the effects of the antihistamine.56 All patients are instructed to return immediately if symptoms recur. Most should be referred for allergy testing, particularly if the attack of anaphylaxis was significant, recurrent, or the stimulus unknown or unavoidable.57 24 36 47 63 (table 10).

Self limiting anaphylaxis

Some patients recover from anaphylaxis with little or no treatment,58 or following apparently unconventional treatment that omits adrenaline.59 The explanation lies with the cellular basis of the anaphylactic reaction itself. Primary mast cell and basophil mediators such as neutrophil chemotactic factor, eosinophil chemotactic factor, and leukotriene LTB4 attract a variety of cells to the area including platelets, neutrophils, eosinophils, lymphocytes, and monocytes. These newly recruited cells in turn release secondary mediators which may augment the reaction, causing a further wave of mast cell degranulation and leading to a vicious cycle of ongoing inflammation associated with increased vascular permeability.60 61 However, some secondary mediators actually inhibit anaphylaxis, particularly those released from eosinophils. Histaminease breaks down histamine, arylsulphatase B inactivates leukotrienes, and phospholipase D destroys platelet activating factor.55 Histamine itself, through H1 receptors, raises intracellular cyclic AMP, thereby reducing mediator release.62 63 Thus in less severe reactions the anaphylactic process may itself be self limiting. Unfortunately, it is impossible to predict disease activity, so all patients should initially be observed for symptom progression.

Conclusions

Anaphylaxis may be mild or severe, gradual in onset or fulminant, involve multiple organ systems or present with isolated shock or wheeze, and may or may not be IgE mediated. Therefore a simple treatment algorithm covering all possible situations is unrealistic. However, treatment protocols that work clinically are available, such as suggested by Gavalas et al in this issue of the journal.64 65 Such protocols should be known to clinicians and even inexperienced doctors should be familiar with them. Adrenaline, oxygen, and fluids are accepted first line treatments. Care with the route, dose, concentration, and speed of delivery of adrenaline in particular underpin its safety and efficacy. Antihistamines, steroids, glucagon, and aminophylline may be considered second line drugs, but require equal thought in their use, especially in weighing up the possible side effects with their perceived benefits. Finally, once the initial drama has settled, proactive discharge planning including allergy referral where appropriate ensures both the immediate and long term safety of the patient, and protects against further, often unheralded, attacks of anaphylaxis.

I am indebted to Carol Bicknell and Jennifer Nelson for their tireless efforts in the preparation of this paper.
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