

# Delinking Cephalosporin Cross Sensitivity Alerts in Patients with Penicillin Allergy Labels

Megan Wang<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Adam Wright<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Cosby A. Stone Jr.<sup>3</sup>, Dr. Allison B. McCoy<sup>2</sup>

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY <sup>1</sup>SyBBURE Research Program, Vanderbilt University, <sup>2</sup>Department of Biomedical Informatics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, <sup>3</sup>Division of Allergy, Pulmonary, Critical Care Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center



### Background

Penicillin allergies and penicillin allergy labels (PALs) in the electronic health

record (EHR) are frequently misdiagnosed and/or inaccurate.



## Methods

 Alert logs, medication orders, and outcomes extracted from Epic's Clarity database for alerts triggered by cephalosporin orders in Vanderbilt University Medical Center (VUMC) inpatients with and without PALs admitted from ~ 2021 - 2023.



- Time between index penicillin reaction and testing (years
- 95% CI Predicted probability of a positive skin test
- Fig 1. Probability of positive immediate hypersensitivity skin testing in patients with immediate reaction history (top: penicillins, bottom: cephalosporins)<sup>1</sup>
- Many EHRs include clinical decision support (CDS) recommending

cephalosporin avoidance due to potential cross-reactivity.



Fig 2. EHR allergy warning for cephalosporin order in patients with PAL

• Though cross sensitivity may occur in select penicillins and cephalosporins,

PALs shouldn't rule out cephalosporin administration<sup>2</sup>.

- Inaccurate PALs = negative patient outcomes from riskier alternatives<sup>3</sup>.
- Objective: Evaluate existing EHR alert recommending cephalosporin avoidance in PAL patients and determine its patient impact.

• Descriptive analysis performed using RStudio to evaluate alert usage

and outcomes in patients administered cephalosporins vs non cephalosporin non penicillin alternatives featuring:

- Stratification by prior tolerance
- Propensity Score Matching (PSM)



Fig 4. PSM groups, matched on Elixhauser score, ICU and surgical admission.

- Tests for significant differences in outcomes:
  - Length of stay (LOS): t test of means
  - Surgical Site Infections/C. *difficile*/anaphylaxis:  $\chi^2$  contingency

## Results

Clinician Responses to PAL Cross Sensitivity Alert When Ordering Cephalosporins\*

Sulfamethoxazole Ciprofloxacin 6.1% 4.5%

Alert Action	Overridden						55.4%	
	Removed			27.9%	Top override reasons: <b>"benefit outweighs risk"</b> (66.3%), "does not apply to patient" (10.6%), "per			
	Viewed	10.6%						, "per
	Canceled	6%			protocol" (9.1%	5), and "inaccu	Irate warning"(	4.5%)
	0	.0 10	.0 20	0.0	30.0 4	0.0	50.0	60.0

Percentage Fig 5. Clinician actions and override reasoning for cephalosporin allergy alert \*response data includes inpatient AND outpatient contexts

Sample Characteristic	Group 1. No PAL + Cephalosporin Administration	Group 2. PAL + Cephalosporin Administration	Group 3. PAL + Alternative Administration	
PSM Matched Group Size*	N= 90995	N= 5061	N= 2396	
% Readmission**	14.6% <sup>b</sup>	42.4% <sup>ax</sup>	62.3% <sup>v</sup>	
Average LOS	4.35 days <sup>ь</sup>	5.02 days <sup>ax</sup>	7.50 days <sup>y</sup>	
Median LOS	1 day <sup>b</sup>	3 days <sup>ax</sup>	5 days <sup>y</sup>	
% SSI	1.65% <sup>b</sup>	1.21% <sup>ax</sup>	2.64% <sup>v</sup>	
% C. diff	0.508% <sup>a</sup>	0.613% <sup>ax</sup>	0.626% ×	
% Anaphylaxis	0.033% <sup>a</sup>	0.071% <sup>ax</sup>	0.129% ×	



\*Other medications include Rifaximin (1.29%), Meropenem (1.09%), Linezolid (0.79%), and <0.50% each of remaining medications.



Lettering indicates statistically significant differences in outcome \*PSM Matching applied between Group 1/Group 2 and Group 2/Group 3 \*\* %readmitted within 30 days

 Table 1. Outcomes of Unique Patient Records Triggered by Cephalosporin Orders

#### Discussion

- Clinicians frequently override current alert knowing the benefits of prescribing cephalosporins over alternatives outweigh risks.
- For most outcomes and groups with a significant sample size, patients not administered cephalosporin in the presence of a PAL fared worse.
- Limitations: generalizability limited to patients in Vanderbilt's EHR system; outcomes limited to those encoded in EHR.
- Conclusion: existing cephalosporin warning for patients with PAL may be

more harmful than beneficial to clinicians and patients.

<b>C. Difficile</b> N= 28 (0.666%) <sup>a</sup>	<b>C. Difficile</b> N= 12 (0.970%) <sup>a</sup>	<b>C. Difficile</b> N= 3 (0.350%) <sup>×</sup>	C. Difficile N= 3 (0.259%) <sup>x</sup> Anaphylaxis N= 2 (0.173%) <sup>x</sup>	
Anaphylaxis N= 3 (0.0713%) <sup>a</sup>	Anaphylaxis N= 1 (0.0810%) <sup>a</sup>	Anaphylaxis N= 0 (0%) <sup>×</sup>		
Average LOS 5.01 days (N= 1587) <sup>a</sup>	Average LOS 7.93 days (N= 681) <sup>b</sup>	Average LOS 5.06 days (N= 306) <sup>×</sup>	Average LOS 6.97 days (N=560)	

Fig 7. Flow chart of patient outcomes partitioned by prior tolerance and cephalosporin or alternative administration

\* Medication Administration excludes patients administered both a cephalosporin and an alternative

Future Plans

- Improve alert specificity for high-risk patients and treatments.
- Automate penicillin risk score calculations using EHR notes.

#### References

 Stone CA Jr, et al. Testing Strategies and Predictors for Evaluating Immediate and Delayed Reactions to Cephalosporins. J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract. 2021 Jan;9(1):435-444.e13. doi: 10.1016/j.jaip.2020.07.056. Epub 2020 Aug 19. PMID: 32822918; PMCID: PMC7855229.
 McCoy AB, et al (2022). Informatics-Enabled Penicillin Allergy Risk Stratification and De-Labeling [Conference presentation]. XGM 2022, Verona, Wisconsin, United States.

3. Yuson CL, et al. 'Cephalosporin allergy' label is misleading. Aust Prescr. 2018 Apr;41(2):37-41. doi: 10.18773/austprescr.2018.008. Epub 2018 Apr 3. Erratum in: Aust Prescr. 2018 Dec;41(6):205. PMID: 29670309; PMCID: PMC5895476.