Early diagnosis and critical management of wound botulism in the emergency department: a single center experience and literature review
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Abstract

Background: Clostridium botulinum remains a major threat to a select population of subcutaneous and intramuscular drug users. We conducted a retrospective study of patients who were diagnosed with wound botulism and their clinical presentations to the Emergency Department (ED).

Results: A total of 21 patients met the inclusion criteria and all had a confirmed history of heroin use disorder. Initial presentation to the ED included generalized weakness (n = 20, 95%), difficulty swallowing (n = 15, 71%), and speech/voice problems (n = 14, 79%). Sixteen patients (76%) also presented with visible skin wounds and fifteen (71%) required mechanical ventilation (MV). Patients who presented with dysphagia as well as dysarthria and/or dysphonia were more likely to require a percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) tube. Patients who required MV and PEG tubes were noted to have a longer hospital length of stay (LOS) due to the severity of the disease progression.

Conclusions: Emergency physicians should remain vigilant about early recognition of wound botulism, especially in patients who inject drugs.
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Introduction

Wound botulism is a life-threatening disease with rapidly worsening clinical course. In the USA, wound botulism is associated with subcutaneous injection of black tar heroin and has a mortality of 13.2% [1, 2]. The introduction of black tar heroin (BTH) in the 1990s led to an increase in non-intravenous injection, most often into the subcutaneous tissue (“skin popping”) and sometimes into muscle. Both methods require less accuracy than IV injection, remain viable after superficial venous access is exhausted, and result in slower absorption of the drug [1, 3]. BTH is still the predominant form of heroin in the USA, and California alone accounts for three-quarters of all wound botulism cases in the country [2]. This method of BTH administration and the associated likelihood of infection by Clostridium botulinum (C. botulinum) has increased morbidity and complications in individuals [1].

There are many opportunities to become contaminated with C. botulinum in the production and distribution process for BTH, and the spores will survive substances and temperatures that kill other bacteria. The
drug is frequently cut with anything of a similar dark brown color, including dirt and wood pulp, which may introduce *C. botulinum* spores. Spores have also been found on drug paraphernalia [1]. Subcutaneous injection then creates an ideal anaerobic breeding ground for *C. botulinum* and the formation of botulinum neurotoxin [1, 2]. The sharing of contaminated needles is also common among a selected demographic of drug users and can contribute to wound botulism [4]. If an abscess develops after injection of BTH, the anaerobic environment allows spores to germinate and the organism to thrive [5]. *C. botulinum* neurotoxin quickly spreads systemically via the lymphatic and vascular systems [4]. Botulism progresses rapidly, and patients may present with bulbar and other nonspecific symptoms such as weakness, dysphagia, gait disturbance, and dyspnea [4].

Early diagnosis requires high clinical suspicion and can be confirmed by electrophysiological and laboratory studies. However, the average delay between blood sample acquisition and results of the toxin assay can be up to a few days [6, 7]. As a result, empiric antitoxin acquisition from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and early administration is recommended as soon as the diagnosis is suspected clinically [7]. Since the antitoxin is only available from the CDC, physicians should anticipate a delay between their request and the arrival of antitoxin at the requesting facility [8]. As a result, acquiring the antitoxin from the CDC is the rate-limiting step to initiating adequate therapy [8]. Prolonged delay of appropriate and necessary treatment can result in rapid clinical deterioration of the patient and even death [9].

Due to the rarity of botulism and clinicians’ unfamiliarity with its clinical presentation, inclusion of the possibility of botulism in the differential diagnosis and subsequent treatment is often absent or delayed. Successful treatment of wound botulism is well known to be time dependent, and a delay in treatment may create a survival risk for the patient. This study aims to evaluate the most prevalent signs and symptoms of patients who presented to the emergency department (ED) with wound botulism and their course of treatment.

**Methods**

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Arrowhead Regional Medical Center (ARMC). ARMC is a 456-bed acute-care teaching facility located in Colton, California. ARMC is an American College of Surgeons verified Level II trauma center and one of the busiest emergency departments in the state of California, with more than 100,000 annual visits, including more than 3000 traumas [10]. ARMC serves the population of the County of San Bernardino, the largest county by area in the contiguous USA and a region with a high incidence of injection drug use.

A search of the ARMC electronic health system (EHR) was conducted for adult patients diagnosed with wound botulism between 2005 and 2020, using both the International Classification of Diseases 9th edition and 10th edition codes for wound botulism. Inclusion criteria were age > 18 years and had clinical symptoms suggestive of wound botulism (bulbar palsies and/or peripheral weakness). Confirmatory studies were performed on all patients, although five individuals either had insufficient blood sample acquisition or did not have the information in their charts. These five patients improved drastically after the administration of antitoxin and were thus included in the study as presumptive cases.

The EHR of each patient was reviewed to include data from ED encounters as well as subsequent inpatient care. The overall data included patients’ age, gender, symptoms at initial ED presentation, physical exam findings, history of illicit drug use, and results of ED diagnostic studies (i.e., labs, radiographs, EKGs). Additionally, patients’ clinical outcome data were collected, including hospital length of stay (LOS), mechanical ventilation, and percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) tube placement.

All statistical analyses were conducted using the SAS software for Windows version 9.4 (Cary, North Carolina, USA). Descriptive statistics were presented as frequencies and percentages for categorical variables, along with means and standard deviations or median and corresponding first and third quartiles for continuous variables. Wilcoxon rank-sum tests were conducted to assess whether the hospital length of stay was different between the categorical predictors. All statistical analyses were two-sided. *P* value < 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

**Results**

A total of twenty-one patients were diagnosed with wound botulism at ARMC between 2005 and 2020. The average age was 38.48 (standard deviation = 8.41) years and seven of the patients were female. The most frequent symptoms during the initial ED encounter include history of heroin use followed by visible wound (*n* = 16, 76.2%), and symmetric motor weakness (*n* = 14, 66.7%). It is also notable that almost half of the patients had visible abscesses (*n* = 10, 47.6%) and more than half had ptosis (*n* = 12, 57.1%). The detailed symptoms list is presented in Table 1.

The physical examination results were analyzed to identify the most frequently noted clinical presentations associated with wound botulism in the ED. The results are presented in Table 2. The most frequent finding was generalized weakness (*n* = 20, 95%), followed by
dysarthria/dysphonia \((n = 14, 79\%)\) and dysphagia \((n = 15, 71\%)\). All other findings occurred in less than 50% of patients.

The effect of mechanical ventilation and PEG tube placement on hospital length of stay was also analyzed. Table 3 presents the results. Patients who were on mechanical ventilation had statistically significantly longer hospital LOS (median) compared with patients without mechanical ventilation \((32 \text{ days vs } 7 \text{ days}, p < 0.001)\).

### Discussion

The natural progression of wound botulism varies from mild and insidious to severe and rapidly progressive. Seven strains of *C. botulinum* exist (A-G), but only A and B strains have been found to be associated with wound botulism secondary to injection drug use \([11]\). Type A is believed to be the most potent strain and causes the most prolonged disease course \([4]\). They are all gram positive, anaerobic rods with subterminal spores that thrive in the anaerobic conditions created by subcutaneous abscesses. *C. botulinum* produces neurotoxin that inhibits acetylcholine release by binding irreversibly

| Symptoms at initial ED presentation | Frequency \((N = 21)\) | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| History of heroin usage            | 21                     | 100.0%     |
| Visible wound                      | 16                     | 76.2%      |
| Symmetric motor weakness           | 14                     | 66.7%      |
| Ptosis                             | 12                     | 57.1%      |
| Visible abscess                    | 10                     | 47.6%      |
| Dysarthria                         | 9                      | 42.9%      |
| Extracocular muscle palsy          | 8                      | 38.1%      |
| Surgical wound drainage            | 7                      | 33.3%      |
| Descending paralysis               | 6                      | 28.6%      |
| Infected abscess                   | 6                      | 28.6%      |
| Signs of IV or subcutaneous heroin use | 5                 | 23.8%      |

| Diagnostic methods                 | Frequency \((N = 21)\) | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Blood sample                       | 11                     | 52.40%     |
| Unclear—antitoxin given            | 6                      | 28.60%     |
| CDC consultation—signs and symptoms| 4                      | 19.10%     |
| Unclear                            | 4                      | 19.10%     |
| EMG study                          | 3                      | 14.30%     |

*All other responses were either “no” or “not documented” by the physician

Similarly, patients with PEG tube insertion had statistically significantly longer hospital LOS (median) compared with patients without PEG tube insertion \((48 \text{ days vs } 17 \text{ days}, p < 0.001)\).

### Table 1 Symptoms at initial ED presentation and diagnostic methods

| Frequency \((N = 21)\) | Percentage  |
|------------------------|-------------|
| Generalized weakness   | 20          | 95.20%     |
| Difficulty swallowing  | 15          | 71.40%     |
| Voice/speech problems  | 14          | 66.70%     |
| Respiratory difficulty | 12          | 57.10%     |
| Double vision/diplopia | 11          | 52.40%     |
| Extremity/wound pain   | 9           | 42.90%     |
| Shortness of breath    | 8           | 38.10%     |
| Fever                  | 7           | 33.30%     |
| Blurry vision          | 6           | 28.60%     |
| Sore throat            | 5           | 23.80%     |
| Vomiting or diarrhea   | 5           | 23.80%     |
| Dizziness              | 5           | 23.80%     |

*All other responses were either “no” or “not documented” by the physician

| Physical examination findings at emergency department presentation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Frequency \((N = 21)\) | Percentage  |
| Generalized weakness   | 20          | 95.20%     |
| Difficulty swallowing  | 15          | 71.40%     |
| Voice/speech problems  | 14          | 66.70%     |
| Respiratory difficulty | 12          | 57.10%     |
| Double vision/diplopia | 11          | 52.40%     |
| Extremity/wound pain   | 9           | 42.90%     |
| Shortness of breath    | 8           | 38.10%     |
| Fever                  | 7           | 33.30%     |
| Blurry vision          | 6           | 28.60%     |
| Sore throat            | 5           | 23.80%     |
| Vomiting or diarrhea   | 5           | 23.80%     |
| Dizziness              | 5           | 23.80%     |

| Hospital LOS by mechanical ventilation and PEG tube status |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Hospital LOS | \(P\) value |
|---------------|-------------|
| MV            | < 0.001     |
| Yes           | 32 (22, 48) |
| No            | 7 (3, 11.25)|
| PEG tube      | <0.001      |
| Yes           | 48 (42, 61) |
| No            | 17 (7, 26)  |

\(MV\) mechanical ventilation, PEG percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy
Lambert-Eaton Syndrome (LES), tick paralysis, or otheretiologies such as the Miller-Fisher syndrome (MFS)quest antitoxin, as well as investigating other possibleaddition, it is suggested that ED physicians rapidly re-
lism for any patient with a history of BTH use, present-
sensitivities as low as 33-44%, whereas neuromuscular
lities. Serum toxin assays have been reported to have
diagnostic evaluation in patients suspected of having
puncture, and other diagnostic modalities as indicated, will
hematocrit, computed tomography (CT) of the brain, lumbar
changes), shortness of breath, and gait disturbances thatwere noted in prior reports [4]. Common physical examfindings included skin wounds, extremity weakness, ptosis,extraocular muscle abnormalities, and hypertension[4]. It is important to know that the process of obtainingbotulinum antitoxin can be very challenging and timeconsuming. The local and/or state public health depart-
progression. It is therefore important to swiftly performan evaluation, make the diagnosis, and initiate treatment.
This process often begins in the emergency department,
and as a result, emergency physicians must have a high clinical suspicion for wound botulism and be able to recognize early signs and symptoms of the disease.

Acknowledgements
Not applicable.

Authors’ contributions
MWKN contributed in the study design, data collection, data interpretation, and writing of the manuscript. FD contributed in data analysis, data interpretation, and writing of the manuscript. CE, RH, and MM contributed in data collection and writing of the manuscript. CL and RB contributed in the study design and writing of the manuscript. ASN and KH contributed in data collection, data analysis, and writing of the manuscript. The authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding
There is no funding to disclose.

Availability of data and materials
Availability of data and materials were available by contacting the corresponding author.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate
This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Arrowhead Regional Medical Center (ARMC). The IRB approval number was 20-21.

Consent for publication
Not applicable. Data were reported in aggregated format. No patient identifiers were included in the reporting.

Competing interests
The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Received: 7 May 2021 Accepted: 27 August 2021
Published online: 22 September 2021

References
1. Tucker RD GY, Frazee B. View from the front lines: an emergency medicine perspective on clostridial infections in injection drug users. Anaeroeb. 2014; 30:108–15.
2. Yuan J, Inami G, Mohle-Boetani J, Vugia DJ. Recurrent wound botulism among injection drug users in California. Clin Infect Dis. 2011;52(7):862–6. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cir805.
3. Michi C, Whitelock C, Sparsky N. It takes a village: the management of extreme sequelae of skin popping. Wounds. 2021;33(1):9–19.
4. Lindström M, Korkela H. Laboratory diagnostics of botulism. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2006;19:296–314.
5. Mechem C, Walter FG. Wound botulism. Veterinary and human toxicology. 1994;36(3):233–7.
6. Botulism in the United States, 1899–1996: Handbook for epidemiologists, clinicians, and laboratory workers (1998). https://www.cdc.gov/botulism/pdf/bot-manual.pdf. Accessed 5 July 2021
7. Rodolico C, Barca E, Fenicia L, Anniballi F, Sinardi A, Girlanda P. Wound botulism in drug users: a still underestimated diagnosis. Neurol Sci. 2010; 31(6):823–7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10072-010-0350-1.
8. Offerman SR, Schaefer M, Thundiyil JG, Cook MD, Holmes JF. Wound botulism in injection drug users: time to antitoxin correlates with intensive care unit length of stay. West J Emerg Med. 2009;10:251.
9. Sobel J. Botulism. Beyond Anthrax. 2009:85–105. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-59745-326-4_5.
10. Neeki M, DuMontier S, Toy J, Archambeau B, Goralnick E, et al. Prehospital trauma care in disasters and other mass casualty incidents—a proposal for hospital-based special medical response teams. Cureus. 2021:13.
11. Cooper JG, Spike CE, Denton M, Jamieson S. Clostridium botulinum: an increasing complication of heroin misuse. Eur J Emerg Med. 2005;12(5):251–2. https://doi.org/10.1056/00063110-20051000-00011.
12. Sandrock CE, Murin S. Clinical predictors of respiratory failure and long-term outcome in black tar heroin-associated wound botulism. Chest. 2001;120(2):562–6. https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.120.2.562.
13. Gallidik N, Nolden-Hoverath S, Kosinski CM, Stegelmeyer U, Schmidt S, Dohmen C, et al. Rapid geographical clustering of wound botulism in Germany after subcutaneous and intramuscular injection of heroin. Neurocrit Care. 2007;6(1):30–4. https://doi.org/10.1385/NCC:6:1:30.
14. Kalka-Moll WM, Aurbach U, Schaumann R, Schwarz R, Seifert H. Wound botulism in injection drug users. Emerg Infect Dis. 2007;13(6):942–3. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1306.061336.
15. Rapoport S, Watkins PB. Descending paralysis resulting from occult wound botulism. Ann Neurol. 1984;16(3):359–61. https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.410160314.
16. Gilhus NE. Lambert-eaton myasthenic syndrome; pathogenesis, diagnosis, and therapy. Autoimmune Dis. 2011;2011:973808. https://doi.org/10.4061/2011/973808.
17. Simon S, Fiebig U, Liu Y, Tienrey R, Dano J, et al. Recommended immunological strategies to screen for botulinum neurotoxin-containing samples. Toxins (Basel). 2015;7:3011–34.
18. Peak OM, Rosen H, Kamali A, Poe A, Shahkarami M, Kimura AC, et al. Wound botulism outbreak among persons who use black tar heroin—San Diego County, California, 2017–2018. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2019;67(5152):1415–8. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6751a3.
19. Sam AH, Beynon HL. Wound botulism. N Engl J Med. 2010;363(25):2444. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc1003352.

Publisher’s Note
Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.