



Pressure Immobilization after North American Crotalinae Snake Envenomation

Journal:	<i>Clinical Toxicology</i>
Manuscript ID:	LCLT-2011-0226
Manuscript Type:	Commentary
Keywords:	Snakes etc < Toxinology, Skin < Organ/tissue specific < Complications of poisoning, Other
Abstract:	N/A

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

POSITION STATEMENT

Pressure Immobilization after North American Crotalinae Snake Envenomation

American College of Medical Toxicology, American Academy of Clinical Toxicology, American Association of Poison Control Centers, European Association of Poison Control Centres, International Society of Toxinology

Background

The vast majority of venomous snake bites treated at health care facilities in the United States each year involve non-neurotoxic Crotalinae species. (1) Large case series reveal the major clinical effect associated with these envenomations to be local tissue injury. Extremity swelling and dermonecrosis are common, with compartment syndrome an infrequent but potentially limb-threatening effect of envenomation. (2,3,4,5) Life-threatening systemic toxicity and death are rare.

Historically, many first-aid measures have been employed in the treatment of snake bites, but none have been shown to improve patient outcome. Pressure immobilization is a technique routinely employed in the pre-hospital management of neurotoxic snake species in Australia. First described by Sutherland and colleagues in the 1970s, pressure immobilization involves wrapping the entire extremity with a bandage and then immobilizing the extremity with a splint. (6) The bandage should generate a pressure between 40-70 mmHg in the upper extremity and 55-70 mmHg in the lower extremity in order to effectively delay systemic absorption of venom. (7)

Several animal studies have demonstrated delayed systemic absorption of venom with pressure immobilization. (6,7,8) However, studies have also revealed that pressure

1
2
3 immobilization bandages are commonly applied incorrectly, even in a simulated setting
4
5 following provider instructions and training. (9,10,11,12) Although the more common
6
7 error is to apply the bandage too loosely, when applied too tightly the bandage may
8
9 function as a tourniquet, causing limb ischemia, and may also increase systemic
10
11 absorption of venom. (7)
12
13

14
15
16
17 Animal models of North American Crotalinae envenomation demonstrate delayed
18
19 systemic absorption of venom and delayed mortality following application of pressure
20
21 immobilization bandages. (13,14,15) However, the local effects of sequestering cytotoxic
22
23 venom in the extremity are less clear. In a swine model of pressure immobilization
24
25 following *C. atrox* lower extremity envenomation, intracompartmental pressure increased
26
27 significantly compared to controls, from a non-surgical range to levels that would prompt
28
29 fasciotomy. (13)
30
31
32

33 34 35 36 Position

37
38 Given that the primary toxic effect of envenomation is local tissue injury, mortality is not
39
40 an ideal outcome measure to extrapolate to human crotaline envenomation. Available
41
42 evidence fails to establish the efficacy of pressure immobilization in humans, but does
43
44 indicate the possibility of serious adverse events arising from its use. The use of pressure
45
46 immobilization for the pre-hospital treatment of North American Crotalinae
47
48 envenomation is not recommended.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements: the organizations acknowledge the efforts of Michael Levine, MD, and Michelle Ruha, MD in creating this position statement.

References

1. Bronstein AC, Spyker DA, Cantilena Jr LR, et al. 2009 Annual report of the American Association of Poison Control Centers' National Poison Data System (NPDS) : 27th Annual Report. *Clin Toxicol.* 2010; 48:979-1178.
2. Corneille MG, Larson S, Stewart RM, et al. A large single-center experience with treatment of patients with crotalid envenomations: outcomes with and evolution of antivenin therapy. *Am J Surg.* 2006; 192(6):848-852.
3. Spiller HA, Bosse GM. Prospective study of morbidity associated with snakebite envenomation. *J Toxicol Clin Toxicol.* 2003; 41(2):125-130.
4. Tanen D, Ruha AM, Graeme K, Curry S. Epidemiology and hospital course of rattlesnake envenomations cared for at a tertiary referral center in central Arizona. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2001; 8(2):177-182.
5. Thorson A, Lavonas EJ, Rouse AM, Kerns WP. Copperhead envenomations in the Carolinas. *J Toxicol Clin Toxicol.* 2003; 41(1):29-35.
6. Sutherland SK, Coulter AR, Harris RD. Rationalisation of first-aid measures for elapid snakebite. *Lancet.* 1979; 27:183-5.
7. Howarth DM, Southee AE, Whyte IM. Lymphatic flow rates and first-aid in simulated peripheral snake or spider envenomation. *Med J Aust.* 1994; 161:695-700.

- 1
2
3 8. German BT, Hack JB, Brewer K, et al. Pressure-immobilization bandages delay
4 toxicity in a porcine model of Eastern coral snake (*Micrurus fulvius fulvius*)
5
6 envenomation. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2005; 45:603-608.
7
- 8
9
10 9. Canale E, Isbister GK, Currie BJ. Investigating pressure bandaging for snakebite
11
12 in a simulated setting: bandage type, training, and the effect of transport. *Emerg*
13
14 *Med Australas.* 2009; 21:184-190.
15
- 16
17 10. Currie BJ, Canale E, Isbister GK. Effectiveness of pressure-immobilization first
18
19 aid for snakebite requires further study. *Emerg Med Australas.* 2008; 20:267-270.
20
- 21
22 11. Norris RL, Ngo J, Nolan K, et al. Physicians and lay people are unable to apply
23
24 pressure immobilization properly in a simulated snakebite scenario. *Wilderness*
25
26 *Environ Med.* 2005; 16:16-21.
27
- 28
29 12. Simpson IK, Tanwar PD, Chittaranjan A, et al. The Ebbinghaus retention curve:
30
31 training does not increase the ability to apply pressure immobilization in
32
33 simulated snake bite – implications for snake bite first aid in the developing
34
35 world. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 2008 May;102(5):451-9.
36
37
- 38
39 13. Bush SP, Green SM, Laack TA, et al. Pressure immobilization delays mortality
40
41 and increases intracompartmental pressure after artificial intramuscular
42
43 rattlesnake envenomation in a porcine model. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2004;44:599-604.
44
- 45
46 14. Meggs WJ, Courtney C, O'Rourke D, et al. Pilot studies of pressure-
47
48 immobilization bandages for rattlesnake envenomations. *Clin Toxicol.* 2010;
49
50 48:61-63.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 15. Sutherland SK, Coulter AR. Early management of bites by the Eastern
4
5 diamondback rattlesnake (*Crotalus adamanteus*): studies in monkeys (*Macaca*
6
7 *fascicularis*). *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 1981; 30:497-200.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only