IJIMM, Volume 3, Issue 10, 2025 ISSN: 2995-5319
http://medicaljournals.eu/index.php/IJIMM/issue/view/3
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INTEGRATIVE AND MODERN MEDICINE

The Ineffectiveness of Antibiotic Skin Testing

Lutfullayev Oltin Oybek o'g'li
Asian International University, Bukhara, Uzbekistan

Abstract: Antibiotic hypersensitivity remains a major concern in clinical practice. Historically, intradermal or subcutaneous tests were performed before antibiotic administration to predict allergic reactions. However, contemporary evidence demonstrates that such practices lack diagnostic accuracy and may introduce significant risks. Consequently, European clinical guidelines no longer recommend routine antibiotic skin testing except in specific, evidence-based contexts. This article reviews the scientific rationale behind the abandonment of pre-antibiotic tests and discusses modern approaches to managing antibiotic hypersensitivity.

Key words: Antibiotic hypersensitivity, skin testing, the Ineffectiveness of Antibiotic Skin testing

Introduction

Antibiotics, particularly β-lactams such as penicillin, are among the most common causes of drug-induced hypersensitivity reactions. To mitigate potential risks, many healthcare systems once adopted a practice known as skin testing, where small doses of antibiotics were administered intradermally or subcutaneously to assess hypersensitivity. While initially perceived as a safety measure, growing evidence revealed fundamental flaws in this approach, leading to its discontinuation in European clinical practice.

The mechanism of drug hypersensitivity reactions Drug hypersensitivity reactions (DHRs) are mediated by the immune system after exposure to drugs. Based on immunologic mechanisms, the Gell and Coombs classification divides them into four categories. Type I (immediate hypersensitivity) is mediated by IgE specific for allergens and occurs usually within a few minutes to an hour after administration; typical clinical manifestations include urticaria, angioneurotic edema, bronchospasm, and anaphylactic shock. Type II is characterized by antigen–antibody interactions, of which the vasculitides are classic examples. Type III is mediated by immune complexes, whose typical clinical manifestations include serum disease and drug-associated vasculitis. many antibiotic-induced hypersensitivity reactions are mediated by T lymphocytes (type IV) or idiosyncratic mechanisms rather than IgE, rendering traditional skin tests ineffective in these cases. The clinical manifestations of Type IV hypersensitivity reactions, mediated by T cells, include eosinophilia, systemic symptom syndrome, Stevens Johnson syndrome, and so on b-lactam antibiotic reactions are defined as immediate reactions (IR) or non-immediate reactions (NIR) based on the time interval from the last dose to the onset of symptoms . IR occurs within 1 h after the last dose administration. The clinical manifestations of IR include urticaria and severe anaphylaxis. NIR occurs more than one hour after the last dose administration and up to several hours or days. The clinical manifestations of NIR include urticaria, angioedema, and maculopapular exanthema.

Limitations of Antibiotic Skin Testing:

1. Low Diagnostic Value

Antibiotic hypersensitivity, especially IgE-mediated reactions, cannot reliably be detected by routine skin injections of the drug. Studies have shown that tests demonstrate both low sensitivity (false negatives, where patients develop anaphylaxis despite a negative test) and low specificity (false positives, leading to unnecessary avoidance of effective drugs).

2. Potential Harm

Paradoxically, the test itself may provoke a severe allergic reaction, including anaphylaxis. In such cases, the patient is exposed to unnecessary risk before receiving therapeutic doses of the antibiotic.

3. Lack of Scientific Evidence

Evidence-based medicine (EBM) requires diagnostic tests to demonstrate reliability, reproducibility, and clinical utility.Skin testing fails to meet these standards. Major studies in Europe and North America found no correlation between test results and actual allergic outcomes, undermining its validity as a predictive tool.

Modern European Guidelines

1. Emphasis on Clinical History

The most important determinant of suspected antibiotic hypersensitivity is a comprehensive medical history, including prior exposure, timing of reaction, and clinical manifestations.

2. Use of Validated Diagnostic Tests

For penicillin and certain β-lactams, validated skin prick tests, intradermal tests with standardized reagents, and serum-specific IgE assays may be considered. These tests are distinct from traditional intradermal tests and have demonstrated better diagnostic performance.

3. Desensitization Protocols

In cases where an antibiotic is indispensable and hypersensitivity is suspected, carefully monitored desensitization procedures may be performed in specialized settings.

4. In Vitro Diagnostic Tests

Modern in vitro assays allow for allergen detection in patient serum or immune cells without direct exposure to the drug. These include:

- Specific IgE (sIgE) Assay: Measures circulating drug-specific IgE antibodies in the serum. It is non-invasive and safe but limited to IgE-mediated reactions. The sensitivity ranges from 50–70% depending on the antibiotic and reagent standardization.
- Basophil Activation Test (BAT): Evaluates basophil activation markers (CD63, CD203c) via flow cytometry following in vitro exposure to the suspected antibiotic. This test can detect both IgE- and non-IgE-mediated reactions, providing higher diagnostic accuracy but requiring specialized laboratory equipment.
- Lymphocyte Transformation Test (LTT): Useful for delayed-type hypersensitivity, this test measures lymphocyte proliferation upon antibiotic exposure in vitro. It helps identify T-cell-mediated reactions but is technically demanding and not routinely available.

5. Drug Provocation Test (DPT)

The drug provocation test remains the gold standard for confirming or excluding antibiotic hypersensitivity. It involves the controlled administration of the suspected drug in gradually increasing doses under close medical supervision. Although highly accurate (90–95%), it carries the risk of inducing systemic reactions and should only be performed in hospital settings equipped for emergency management.

6. Patch Testing and Other Methods

Patch testing is particularly valuable for detecting delayed-type cutaneous drug eruptions, such as maculopapular or fixed drug eruptions. It involves the application of the suspected antibiotic to the skin under occlusion for 48 hours, followed by delayed readings at 48 and 72 hours. While less risky, its sensitivity and specificity vary depending on the antibiotic and reaction type.

Discussion

The abandonment of antibiotic tests in Europe reflects a shift toward patient safety and evidence-based medicine. Continuing this outdated practice not only provides false reassurance but may also delay appropriate therapy or provoke iatrogenic harm. Instead, modern strategies emphasize clinical risk stratification, validated allergy testing, and judicious antibiotic use.

Conclusion

Routine pre-antibiotic testing is ineffective, unsafe, and unsupported by scientific evidence. European clinical guidelines have rightly abandoned this practice, replacing it with more accurate and safer diagnostic approaches. Adoption of similar evidence-based strategies in other healthcare systems would likely improve patient safety, reduce unnecessary antibiotic restrictions, and align practice with contemporary standards of care.

As understanding of immunopathogenic mechanisms in drug allergy evolves, diagnostic strategies have transitioned from conventional skin tests to molecular and cellular assays. Combining in vitro methods such as sIgE, BAT, or LTT with carefully monitored provocation testing enhances diagnostic precision while minimizing risk. Future advancements in standardization and biomarker discovery are expected to further refine antibiotic allergy diagnosis and improve patient safety.

References

1. Romano A, Gaeta F, Arribas Poves MF, Valluzzi RL. Diagnosing hypersensitivity reactions to beta-lactams. Curr Allergy Asthma Rep. 2016;16(3):30.
2. Demoly P, Adkinson NF, Brockow K, et al. International consensus on drug allergy. Allergy. 2014;69(4):420–437.
3. Torres MJ, Mayorga C, Blanca M. Non-immediate allergic reactions induced by drugs: pathogenesis and diagnostic tests. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol. 2009;19(2):80–90.
4. Hausmann O, Schnyder B, Pichler WJ. Drug hypersensitivity reactions involving skin. Handb Exp Pharmacol. 2010;196:29–55.
5. CLINICAL AND MORPHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF GASTROENTERITIS IN CALVES AND THEIR THERAPY WITH TERFUMENS. (2024). International Journal of Medical Sciences, 4(12), 137-139. https://doi.org/10.55640/
6. Xalmova, Y. (2025). MODERN CONCEPTS OF BIOCHEMISTRY OF BLOOD COAGULATION. Modern Science and Research, 4(3), 769-777.
7. Xalimova, Y. (2025). JIGAR SIRROZIDAGI GEMATOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR. Modern Science and Research, 4(4), 409-418.
8. Халимова, Ю. (2025). ГЕМАТОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ ПРИ ЦИРРОЗЕ ПЕЧЕНИ. Modern Science and Research, 4(4), 419-428.
9. Xalimova, Y. (2025). HEMATOLOGICAL STUDIES IN LIVER CIRRHOSIS. Modern Science and Research, 4(4), 1066-1074.
10. Халимова, Ю. С. (2025). СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ПРЕДСТАВЛЕНИЯ О БИОХИМИИ СВЕРТЫВАНИЯ КРОВИ. Tadqiqotlar, 59(1), 16-23.
11. Халимова, Ю. С. (2025). АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ И КЛИНИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ ТЕЧЕНИЯ СИНДРОМА ПОЛИКИСТОЗНЫХ ЯИЧНИКОВ. Tadqiqotlar, 59(1), 24-34.
12. Халимова, Ю. С. (2025). КЛИНИЧЕСКИЕ И МОРФОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ ГЕМОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ БОЛЕЗНИ НОВОРОЖДЕННЫХ. Tadqiqotlar, 59(1), 9-15.

13. Toxirovna, E. G. (2024). QALQONSIMON BEZ KASALLIKLARIDAN HASHIMOTO TIREODIT KASALLIGINING MORFOFUNKSIONAL O'ZIGA XOSLIGI. Modern education and development, 16(7), 120-135.
14. Toxirovna, E. G. (2024). REVMATOID ARTRIT: BO'G'IMLAR YALLIG'LANISHINING SABABLARI, KLINIK BELGILARI, OQIBATLARI VA ZAMONAVIY DAVOLASH YONDASHUVLARI. Modern education and development, 16(7), 136-148.
15. Эргашева, Г. Т. (2024). ОЦЕНКА КЛИНИЧЕСКОЙ ЭФФЕКТИВНОСТИ ОРЛИСТАТА У БОЛЬНЫХ ОЖИРЕНИЕМ И АРТЕРИАЛЬНОЙ ГИПЕРТЕНЗИЕЙ. Modern education and development, 16(7), 92-105.
16. Ergasheva, G. T. (2024). THE SPECIFICITY OFAUTOIMMUNE THYROIDITIS IN PREGNANCY. European Journal of Modern Medicine and Practice, 4(11), 448-453.
17. Эргашева, Г. Т. (2024). ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ ФУНКЦИИ ЩИТОВИДНОЙ ЖЕЛЕЗЫ ПРИ ТИРЕОИДИТЕ ХАШИМОТО. Modern education and development, 16(7), 106-119.