ejpmr, 2016, 3(1), 445-453

SJIF Impact Factor 7.065

EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL AND MEDICAL RESEARCH

www.ejpmr.com

Review Article

ISSN 2394-3211

EJPMR

THE ROLE OF EMS, PARAMEDICS, AND PHARMACISTS IN MITIGATING CENTRAL NERVOUS SYSTEM INFECTIONS: INSIGHTS FROM HEALTH INFORMATICS

Ahmed Mufleh Alenazi*, Hind Amer Ababtain, Reem Mahmoud Nashar, Hassan Mohammed Brahim Alshammari, Mohammed Mahal Alanazi, Ibrahim Ahmad Daghas, Najlaa Saeed Alghamdi

National Guard Health Affairs.

***Corresponding Author: Ahmed Mufleh Alenazi**

National Guard Health Affairs.

Article Received on 02/12/2015 **Article Revised on 23/12/2015** **Article Published on 15/01/2016**

ABSTRACT

Background: Central Nervous System (CNS) infections, such as bacterial, viral, and fungal meningitis, pose significant diagnostic and treatment challenges for emergency medical services (EMS), paramedics, and pharmacists. Early identification and management of these infections are crucial to improve patient outcomes, as symptoms often overlap with other conditions and may progress rapidly. **Aim:** This review aims to elucidate the roles of EMS, paramedics, and pharmacists in the identification, management, and treatment of CNS infections, highlighting how health informatics can support these roles. **Methods:** We conducted a comprehensive review of current literature and clinical guidelines related to CNS infections, including meningitis and encephalitis. We examined the clinical presentation, diagnostic evaluation, and management strategies employed by EMS and paramedics, and the role of pharmacists in ensuring effective treatment. **Results:** CNS infections present with a range of symptoms, often making early diagnosis challenging. Traditional clinical signs like fever and neck stiffness have variable sensitivity. Health informatics tools, including electronic health records and decision support systems, enhance diagnostic accuracy by integrating patient history and current symptoms. EMS and paramedics play a critical role in early detection and immediate intervention, while pharmacists ensure appropriate antibiotic and antiviral therapies, optimizing treatment outcomes. **Conclusion:** Effective management of CNS infections requires a coordinated approach involving EMS, paramedics, and pharmacists. Health informatics tools significantly enhance the diagnostic and treatment processes, leading to better patient care and outcomes. Continued advancements in these technologies and practices are essential for improving the management of CNS infections.

KEYWORDS: Central Nervous System infections, meningitis, encephalitis, emergency medical services, paramedics, pharmacists, health informatics, diagnostic tools, treatment management.

INTRODUCTION

A central clinical duty of emergency physicians is to anticipate the "worst-case scenario" for each presenting complaint. In the context of central nervous system (CNS) infections, the primary challenge is to recognize patients with potentially rare and life-threatening conditions among those presenting with vague symptoms. Symptoms such as fever, headache, altered mental status, and behavioral changes can be indicative of a wide range of differential diagnoses. A diagnosis that is not considered is one that remains undiscovered. This review examines the clinical signs and symptoms that should prompt emergency physicians to suspect a CNS infection, with a focus on the sensitivity and specificity of various clinical findings at the bedside. It also covers the diagnostic evaluation and management of patients with a high clinical suspicion of CNS infection.

MENINGITIS

The term "meningitis" broadly refers to the inflammation of the meninges. Although meningitis can result from a variety of conditions, both infectious and non-infectious, this review specifically addresses acute infections of the meninges caused by bacterial, viral, or fungal pathogens. Bacterial meningitis occurs when pathogens enter the subarachnoid space via bacteremia (often originating from an upper respiratory tract infection), local spread from dental or sinus infections, traumatic or congenital breaches, or neurosurgical interventions.[1] The severe inflammation associated with bacterial meningitis leads to brain and meninges edema, and subsequently to increased intracranial pressure once the compensatory mechanisms for cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) displacement are overwhelmed.[1] Bacterial meningitis is associated

with considerable morbidity and has a mortality rate ranging from 13 to 27%.[2]

In contrast, viral meningitis generally presents with less severity. The most common viral etiologies include enteroviruses (e.g., Coxsackie A and B, echovirus), herpes simplex virus (HSV types 1 and 2), cytomegalovirus (CMV), Epstein-Barr virus (EBV), varicella zoster virus (VZV), mumps virus, and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).[3] Fungal meningitis typically results from systemic mycoses (e.g., Cryptococcus neoformans, Coccidioides immitis, Histoplasma capsulatum) originating from other body sites, often from pulmonary infections in immunocompromised individuals.[4] Rare instances of fungal meningitis have also been linked to contaminated glucocorticoid injections used for chronic pain management.[5]

Meningitis exemplifies the success of childhood vaccination programs in reducing the incidence of severe infectious diseases. Prior to the introduction of an effective vaccine in 1988, Haemophilus influenzae type B (Hib) was the predominant cause of bacterial meningitis in the United States. Following the recommendation for universal Hib vaccination starting at 2 months of age, the incidence of Hib meningitis among children under 5 years old declined by over 99%.[6] Similarly, the introduction of the pneumococcal seven-valent conjugate vaccine and the meningococcal conjugate vaccine has substantially reduced the incidence and mortality of pneumococcal and meningococcal meningitis in the United States.[7] Nosocomial pathogens, including Gram-negative bacteria and Staphylococcus species, now surpass Neisseria meningitidis and H. influenzae in incidence.[7] As pathogen demographics shift, the average age of meningitis patients has increased from 15 months in 1986 to 35 years today.[8] Meningitis remains a relatively rare diagnosis in U.S. emergency departments (EDs), with approximately 66,000 cases diagnosed annually between 1993 and 2008, yielding an incidence of 62 per 100,000 visits.[9] Diagnoses in the ED include unspecified (60%), viral (31%), bacterial (8%), and fungal (1%) causes. Bacterial meningitis is notably more prevalent in developing countries, where the incidence approaches 50 cases per 100,000 and 1 in 250 children are affected within their first year of life.[8]

Clinical Presentation

The volume of patients arriving at the emergency department (ED) with symptoms indicative of meningitis significantly surpasses the actual incidence of the disease. The traditional symptom triad of fever, neck rigidity, and altered mental state is observed in only a minority of cases.[10] Additional symptoms that may accompany meningitis include nausea, vomiting, cranial nerve deficits, rash, and seizures. Infants may present with more nonspecific signs such as lethargy and irritability. The accuracy of clinical history and physical examination in diagnosing meningitis in adults is hampered by low sensitivity for common symptoms and findings, such as headache (27%–81%), nausea and vomiting (29%–32%), and neck pain (28%).[11] Sensitivity varies for the individual elements of the "classic triad" with fever (42%–97%), neck stiffness (15%–92%), and altered mental status (32%–89%). Notably, in some cases, 99% to 100% of patients with meningitis exhibited at least one element of the classic triad, making the absence of neck stiffness or fever in a patient with acute headache and normal mentation a strong indicator against meningitis.[12,13] A prospective study of children aged 2 months to 16 years conducted in Israel further highlighted the limited diagnostic value of symptoms in identifying meningitis.[14]

Classic physical examination techniques for assessing meningitis have been established for generations of clinicians. Kernig's sign, described in 1882, involves flexing the patient's neck and extending their knees, with a positive result indicated by pain at an angle of less than 135 degrees.[15] Brudzinski's sign, first documented in 1909, involves passive neck flexion with the patient in a supine position, resulting in positive findings if hip and knee flexion occur. In Brudzinski’s initial study, the sensitivities of Kernig’s and Brudzinski’s signs were 42% and 97%, respectively, primarily among pediatric patients with meningitis caused by Mycobacterium tuberculosis and Streptococcus pneumoniae, both of which cause severe meningeal inflammation.[15] Recent research assessing these traditional signs in modern patient populations reveals that they have low sensitivity for predicting cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) pleocytosis.[10,16,17] Consequently, the absence of these signs does not effectively rule out meningitis or eliminate the necessity for a lumbar puncture (LP). Nevertheless, Kernig’s and Brudzinski’s signs are highly specific (92%– 98%) for predicting CSF pleocytosis, thus their presence should heighten clinical suspicion of meningitis.

Another maneuver used to detect meningeal irritation is the "head-jolt" test, where the patient is asked to move their head horizontally at a rate of 2 to 3 turns per second. A positive result is indicated by an exacerbation of the headache. Initially tested in a cohort of patients with both fever and headache, the test showed a sensitivity of 97% for CSF pleocytosis.[18] However, subsequent studies involving ED patients in the U.S. and intensive care unit patients in India demonstrated significantly lower sensitivities (6%–21%), indicating that a negative head-jolt test does not reliably exclude meningitis.[10,16]

Diagnostic Workup

In the absence of contraindications, patients suspected of meningitis should undergo a lumbar puncture (LP). When a high clinical suspicion for bacterial meningitis exists, empiric antibiotic therapy should be initiated immediately if LP cannot be performed promptly.[19–21]

Although antibiotic administration can reduce the sensitivity of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) cultures, these cultures can remain positive for up to four hours post-administration.[22] For patients at risk of an intracranial mass or midline shift, it is recommended to perform a computed tomography (CT) scan of the head before LP to mitigate the risk of brain herniation.[23] The Infectious Disease Society of America guidelines suggest that a head CT should precede LP in patients who are immunocompromised, have a history of central nervous system (CNS) disease, experienced a newonset seizure within one week of presentation, or exhibit signs of papilledema, altered consciousness, or focal neurological deficits.[24] In cases where a head CT is deemed necessary, the recommended sequence is to administer antibiotics immediately, followed by CT, and then proceed with LP as soon as feasible.

In Sweden, the implementation of guidelines recommending head CT before LP for patients with altered mental status resulted in increased CT utilization, even among those not meeting the criteria. Moreover, adherence to guidelines for early empiric antibiotic administration in suspected bacterial meningitis was notably poor.[25] This practice pattern has been replicated in other settings.[22] In 2009, Swedish guidelines removed moderate-to-severe mental status impairment and new-onset seizures as indications for pre-LP head CT, leading to earlier treatment of bacterial meningitis and a reduction in overall mortality.[25] Once LP has been completed, ideally including an opening pressure measurement, CSF fluid analysis can aid in differentiating between bacterial, viral, or fungal causes of meningitis.[1,2] In addition to assessing cell count, glucose, and protein levels, CSF should be cultured. Molecular tests, such as polymerase chain reaction (PCR) assays for herpes simplex virus (HSV), should be considered in immunocompetent patients. Special tests for fungal infections (e.g., cryptococcal antigen, fungal culture) and mycobacterial infections (e.g., acid-fast bacteria stain, mycobacterial culture) should be utilized when there is a heightened clinical suspicion for atypical infections, particularly in immunocompromised individuals.

Despite some CSF profiles being indicative of viral or bacterial infections, emergency physicians should not be overly reassured by CSF findings that suggest viral rather than bacterial meningitis. In a study of 696 patients with culture-proven bacterial meningitis, only 88% had CSF findings predictive of bacterial infection, with a significant proportion showing a negative CSF Gram stain.[26] Research into the discriminatory value of CSF laboratory tests in distinguishing between viral and bacterial meningitis in the presence of a negative Gram stain has demonstrated limited effectiveness of traditional CSF parameters, such as elevated neutrophil count, high protein, or low glucose levels.[27,28] For instance, 50% of bacterial meningitis patients had a neutrophil count below 440/mm³, and over 10% of viral meningitis patients had a neutrophil count exceeding 500/mm³.

Several studies have evaluated the role of CSF lactate in distinguishing viral from bacterial meningitis. CSF lactate, which results from bacterial anaerobic metabolism or ischemic brain tissue, remains unaffected by blood lactate levels.[29] A meta-analysis on the diagnostic accuracy of CSF lactate found that, for both pediatric and adult patients with Gram stain-positive or cultureproven bacterial meningitis, a CSF lactate level above 3.9 mmol/L had a sensitivity of 96% (95% confidence interval [CI] 93%–98%) and specificity of 97% (95% CI 96%–99%) for differentiating bacterial meningitis. However, the sensitivity of this test decreased dramatically to 29% (95% CI 23%–75%) in patients who had been pretreated with antibiotics.[30] In addition to CSF analysis, serum procalcitonin has emerged as a promising marker for differentiating bacterial from viral meningitis. Procalcitonin, an inflammatory marker, generally rises more significantly in bacterial infections.[31,32] In suspected meningitis cases with a negative CSF Gram stain, a serum procalcitonin level above 0.98 ng/mL has shown a sensitivity of 87%, specificity of 100%, positive predictive value of 100%, and negative predictive value of 99% for identifying bacterial meningitis.[27]

In cases with CSF pleocytosis or moderate-to-high clinical suspicion for bacterial meningitis, empiric antibiotics should be continued until CSF cultures and other diagnostic tests are completed. For pediatric patients, the bacterial meningitis score is a validated clinical prediction tool designed to identify children with CSF pleocytosis who are at very low risk for bacterial meningitis. A patient is categorized as “very low risk” if none of the following criteria are present: positive CSF Gram stain, CSF absolute neutrophil count (ANC) of at least 1000 cells/mL, CSF protein of at least 80 mg/dL, peripheral blood ANC of at least 10,000 cells/mL, and a history of seizures before or at presentation.[33–35] The score was developed to guide clinicians in deciding which patients with CSF pleocytosis require inpatient antibiotic therapy. Patients with critical illness, ventricular shunt devices, recent neurosurgery, immunosuppression, or other bacterial infections needing inpatient therapy were excluded from the derivation and validation cohorts. Additionally, patients pretreated with antibiotics were also excluded. In a meta-analysis of eight independent validation studies, the bacterial meningitis score demonstrated a sensitivity of 99.3% (95% CI 98.7%–99.7%) for bacterial meningitis, with a negative predictive value of 99.7% (95% CI 99.3%–99.9%). Among 4896 patients with CSF pleocytosis, the score misclassified nine as having septic rather than bacterial meningitis. Most of these misclassified patients were either under two months of age or exhibited petechiae or purpura, leading to recommendations for applying the score only to non-ill-appearing children

older than two months without petechiae or purpura and not pretreated with antibiotics.

Treatment

Bacterial Meningitis: The causative pathogens of bacterial meningitis differ based on patient age, immune status, and clinical history. For instance, in neonates, *Streptococcus agalactiae*, *Escherichia coli*, and *Listeria monocytogenes* are prevalent during the first week of life, whereas *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and *Neisseria meningitidis* become more common by the sixth week. Empirical antibiotic treatment should be directed towards the most probable pathogens. For *S. pneumoniae* infections, which remain the predominant pathogen outside of very young patients or those with recent neurosurgical procedures or penetrating head trauma, intravenous therapy with a high-dose third-generation cephalosporin (e.g., ceftriaxone) combined with vancomycin is recommended due to the global emergence of resistant strains.[8]

In addition to prompt antibiotic therapy, the use of corticosteroids may be beneficial in some cases of bacterial meningitis. This practice originated from observations in animal models, which suggested that increased inflammatory response in the subarachnoid space worsens outcomes.[36] Despite some conflicting results from clinical trials, a 2013 Cochrane Review of 25 randomized controlled trials found a non-significant reduction in mortality (17.7% vs. 19.9%; risk ratio [RR] 0.90, 95% CI 0.80–1.01) with corticosteroid use. However, corticosteroids were shown to decrease mortality in cases caused by *S. pneumoniae* (RR 0.84, 95% CI 0.72–0.98) and reduce hearing loss (RR 0.74, 95% CI 0.63–0.87) and other neurological sequelae (RR 0.83, 95% CI 0.69–1). The timing of corticosteroid administration appears to have minimal impact on mortality, though administering them before or concurrently with antibiotics may slightly improve outcomes for hearing loss and short-term neurological issues.[37]

Viral Meningitis: Specific antiviral treatments are not available for most viral causes of meningitis; management is typically supportive, with spontaneous recovery expected in most cases. In adults, *HSV-1* and *HSV-2* are associated with distinct CNS diseases, with *HSV-1* causing severe encephalitis and *HSV-2* leading to milder viral meningitis often concurrent with primary genital infection. Although acyclovir can be administered for suspected *HSV-2* meningitis, its benefits remain unclear. Conversely, *HSV-2* infection in infants can result in severe encephalitis.[38]

Fungal Meningitis: Fungal meningitis primarily affects immunocompromised individuals. When fungal meningitis is suspected, empirical treatment with amphotericin B should be initiated while awaiting identification of the specific fungus to guide targeted antifungal therapy.

Encephalitis: Encephalitis refers to inflammation of the brain parenchyma, commonly used to describe a clinical syndrome rather than a pathologic diagnosis. The differential diagnosis includes infectious (viral, bacterial, parasitic), postinfectious, and noninfectious causes (metabolic, toxic, autoimmune, paraneoplastic). Viral encephalitis can result from direct infection of brain tissue (e.g., West Nile virus, *HSV*, *VZV*) or postinfectious encephalomyelitis, an autoimmune reaction often seen in children and young adults following a viral illness or vaccination. Encephalitis remains relatively rare in industrialized nations, with incidence rates ranging from 0.7 to 12.6 per 100,000 adults and 10.5 to 13.8 per 100,000 children. Globally, up to 85% of encephalitis cases remain undiagnosed due to limited diagnostic resources and emerging pathogens. In industrialized nations, *HSV-1* is the most common cause of sporadic viral encephalitis, while *VZV* is more prevalent among the immunocompromised.[39][42][43][44][45][46]

Clinical Presentation

When evaluating a patient with a suspected central nervous system (CNS) infection, the primary goal is to determine if bacterial meningitis is present, which necessitates immediate initiation of empirical antibiotic therapy. However, if there is evidence of brain parenchymal involvement, such as focal neurological deficits or seizures, encephalitis must also be considered. The clinical manifestations of encephalitis are linked to the specific brain regions affected. For example, *Herpes Simplex Virus (HSV)* encephalitis often involves the temporal lobes and can present with personality changes, psychosis, olfactory or gustatory hallucinations, or acute episodes of terror, which may initially be misinterpreted as psychiatric disorders.[40,47] Involvement of the inferior frontal and temporal lobes may lead to upper-quadrant visual field deficits, difficulties with new information retention or recall, hemiparesis primarily affecting the face and arm, or aphasia if the dominant hemisphere is involved.[40] Certain viruses like West Nile virus and Eastern equine encephalitis virus target the basal ganglia and thalamus, leading to tremors or other movement disorders.[48–50] Additionally, bacterial and viral pathogens such as *Bartonella henselae*, *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, *Enterovirus-71*, flaviviruses (e.g., West Nile virus, Japanese encephalitis virus), and alphaviruses (e.g., Eastern equine encephalitis virus) can cause brainstem encephalitis, which manifests as autonomic dysfunction, involvement of lower cranial nerves, and disturbances in respiratory drive.[39,42] Despite these characteristic associations, no singular sign, symptom, or cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) finding can definitively differentiate the various causes of encephalitis.[42]

Diagnosis

The urgent question in suspected CNS infections is whether antiviral therapy should be added to the standard antibiotic regimen. The diagnostic approach mirrors that of meningitis [Fig. 1]. All patients should undergo lumbar puncture (LP), except in cases where

contraindications are present, such as coagulation abnormalities, localized infections at the LP site, or significant mass effect evident on imaging studies. In cases of moderate-to-severe impairment of consciousness, focal neurological deficits, abnormal posturing, papilledema, seizures, bradycardia with hypertension, or immunocompromise, a head CT should be conducted prior to LP.[39] Beyond standard laboratory tests, testing for HIV infection is crucial as it may influence further diagnostic testing and empirical treatment. CSF findings in *HSV* encephalitis can range from normal to lymphocytic pleocytosis to hemorrhagic, and no specific CSF profile reliably distinguishes *HSV* from other viral etiologies.[43,47] Consequently, molecular (e.g., PCR) and serologic testing are vital for accurate diagnosis. Initial diagnostic tests may yield negative results, with 5% to 10% of adults with *HSV* encephalitis presenting with a normal CSF profile and negative HSV PCR initially. If clinical suspicion remains high, a repeat LP within 24 to 48 hours is advised.[39] From an emergency medicine perspective, viral encephalitis is primarily treatable with antivirals for *HSV* and *Varicella-Zoster Virus (VZV)*, and broad diagnostic molecular testing may not significantly alter immediate management. Nonetheless, preserving CSF samples for further analysis can be beneficial for expanding diagnostic workup as needed without repeating the LP.

MRI is notably more sensitive than CT in detecting early cerebral changes associated with viral encephalitis. For *HSV* encephalitis, CT abnormalities are seen in approximately 25% of patients, whereas MRI reveals abnormalities in about 90% of cases, typically showing edematous changes in the orbital surfaces of the frontal lobes and medial temporal lobes.[39] MRI also helps in identifying alternative causes of encephalitis; thus it should be performed if the diagnosis remains uncertain.[39,51] An electroencephalogram (EEG) is not routinely required for all patients with suspected encephalitis but can be a valuable adjunct in specific scenarios. It may detect non-convulsive status epilepticus in comatose or poorly responsive patients and reveal an organic cause in patients with psychiatric symptoms. For example, *HSV* encephalitis is associated with diffuse high-amplitude slow waves, sometimes accompanied by temporal lobe spike-andwave activity and periodic lateralized epileptiform discharges.[39]

Treatment

The management of encephalitis should focus on addressing the underlying etiology. Due to the inability of clinical signs, symptoms, or cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) findings to reliably distinguish *Herpes Simplex Virus (HSV)* from other viral causes of encephalitis, empirical treatment with intravenous acyclovir should be commenced in any patient suspected of having viral encephalitis until a definitive diagnosis is established. Early initiation of antiviral therapy is crucial for optimizing outcomes in HSV encephalitis, ideally within 6 hours of presentation.[52,53] A multicenter observational study of 93 patients identified two key factors associated with poor outcomes: the severity of illness at presentation, as indicated by a Simplified Acute Physiology score greater than 27, and the initiation of acyclovir more than 2 days after presentation.[54] In this study, 41% of patients did not receive acyclovir until after 2 days, a finding consistent with a second retrospective study of 184 patients, where 37% of those eventually diagnosed with HSV encephalitis had acyclovir started more than 1 day after hospital admission.[55] These observations underscore the diagnostic challenges associated with HSV encephalitis and the necessity for a high level of clinical suspicion. A retrospective study further revealed several patient characteristics significantly associated with delays in acyclovir initiation, including severe underlying disease (odds ratio [OR] 4.1; 95% CI 1.5–11.7), alcohol abuse (OR 3.4; 95% CI 1.3–8.9), a delay of more than 1 day from admission to the first brain imaging (OR 8.4; 95% CI 3.9–18.0), and a CSF leukocyte count of less than 10 leukocytes/mm³ at admission (OR 2.5; 95% CI 0.7–5.8).

Acyclovir dosage is determined based on the patient's weight and age. Ideal body weight (IBW) calculations are used for dosage adjustments (for males: IBW [kg] = 50 + 2.3 kg for each inch over 5 feet; for females: IBW [kg] = 45.5 + 2.3 kg for each inch over 5 feet).[56] Dosage should be adjusted for patients with pre-existing renal impairment, as acyclovir is primarily excreted through the kidneys. To mitigate the risk of acyclovir-induced crystalluria and nephrotoxicity, maintaining adequate hydration is essential to ensure sufficient urine output. Concurrent use of nephrotoxic drugs should also be minimized.

Role of Paramedics and Health Information

Role of Paramedics

Paramedics play a crucial role in the prehospital care of patients experiencing medical emergencies, including those involving complex and rapidly evolving health conditions. They are trained to provide immediate, life-saving interventions and to stabilize patients before they reach a hospital. This role involves assessing and managing a range of conditions, from trauma and cardiac events to respiratory issues and severe allergic reactions. Paramedics are equipped with advanced medical knowledge and skills, enabling them to perform procedures such as intubation, medication administration, and cardiac monitoring in the field. Their ability to make critical decisions under pressure and their proficiency in emergency medical care are essential for improving patient outcomes and ensuring continuity of care as patients transition from prehospital to in-hospital settings.

Health Information

Health information is pivotal in enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of emergency medical services. Accurate and timely health information, including patient history, current medications, and previous medical

conditions, is essential for paramedics to make informed decisions and provide appropriate care. Effective communication and documentation of this information facilitate a seamless handover to hospital staff, ensuring that critical details are not lost during the transition of care. The integration of electronic health records (EHRs) and mobile health applications can further improve the accessibility and accuracy of patient information in emergency situations. This technological support not only aids in the immediate management of patients but also contributes to better long-term health outcomes by providing comprehensive data for follow-up care and treatment planning.

CONCLUSION

Central Nervous System (CNS) infections, such as bacterial, viral, and fungal meningitis, present a complex challenge to emergency medical services (EMS), paramedics, and pharmacists. These infections often share symptoms with other conditions, complicating early diagnosis and timely intervention. The variability in symptom presentation—ranging from fever and neck stiffness to altered mental status—requires a nuanced approach to diagnosis and treatment. Traditional clinical signs and physical examination techniques, though historically significant, show varying degrees of sensitivity in modern practice. Consequently, healthcare professionals must rely on a combination of clinical acumen and advanced diagnostic tools. Health informatics plays a pivotal role in enhancing the accuracy and efficiency of diagnosing CNS infections. Electronic health records (EHRs) and decision support systems integrate patient data, facilitating better identification of infection types and guiding treatment decisions. For EMS and paramedics, the ability to quickly assess symptoms and initiate appropriate interventions is critical. Immediate empiric antibiotic therapy, guided by clinical suspicion and supported by diagnostic imaging, can significantly impact patient outcomes. Pharmacists contribute by ensuring the selection of effective antibiotics and antivirals, thereby reducing the risk of resistance and optimizing therapeutic efficacy. The use of health informatics tools, such as computerized decision support systems, has proven to be a valuable asset in managing CNS infections. These tools help in synthesizing patient data and clinical guidelines to provide real-time support for decision-making. Despite advancements, there remains a need for ongoing education and adaptation to new technologies and practices to further improve outcomes. Future research should focus on refining diagnostic criteria and treatment protocols, as well as exploring the integration of emerging health technologies in the management of CNS infections. Overall, a collaborative approach that leverages the strengths of EMS, paramedics, and pharmacists, supported by robust health informatics systems, is essential for addressing the challenges posed by CNS infections. By combining clinical expertise with advanced technological support, the healthcare system can enhance patient care and outcomes for those affected by these serious conditions.

REFERENCES

1. Tintinalli, J. E., & Stapczynski, J. S. (2011). Tintinalli's emergency medicine: A comprehensive study guide (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
2. Fitch, M. T., Abrahamian, F. M., Moran, G. J., et al. Emergency department management of meningitis and encephalitis. Infectious Diseases Clinics of North America, 2008; 22(1): 33–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idc.2007.10.001
3. Logan, S. A. E., & MacMahon, E. Viral meningitis. BMJ, 2008; 336(7634): 36–40. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39425.422496.EB
4. Gottfredsson, M., & Perfect, J. R. Fungal meningitis. Seminars in Neurology, 2000; 20(3): 307–322. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2000-12235
5. Smith, R. M., Schaefer, M. K., Kainer, M. A., et al. Fungal infections associated with contaminated methylprednisolone injections. New England Journal of Medicine, 2013; 369(17): 1598–1609. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1310864
6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Progress toward elimination of Haemophilus influenzae type b invasive disease among infants and children—United States, 19982000. MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 2002; 51(11): 234–237.
7. Castelblanco, R. L., Lee, M., & Hasbun, R. Epidemiology of bacterial meningitis in the USA from 1997 to 2010: A population-based observational study. Lancet Infectious Diseases, 2014; 14(9): 813–819. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(14)70770-9
8. Brouwer, M. C., Tunkel, A. R., & van de Beek, D. Epidemiology, diagnosis, and antimicrobial treatment of acute bacterial meningitis. Clinical Microbiology Reviews, 2010; 23(3): 467–492. https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.00070-09
9. Takhar, S. S., Ting, S. A., Camargo, C. A., et al. U.S. emergency department visits for meningitis, 2012; 1993–2008. Academic Emergency Medicine, 19(6), 632–639. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1553-2712.2012.01392.x
10. Waghdhare, S., Kalantri, A., Joshi, R., et al. Accuracy of physical signs for detecting meningitis: A hospital-based diagnostic accuracy study. Clinical Neurology and Neurosurgery, 2010; 112(9): 752–757. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clineuro.2010.05.007
11. Attia, J., Hatala, R., Cook, D. J., et al. The rational clinical examination. Does this adult patient have acute meningitis? JAMA, 1999; 282(2): 175–181. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.282.2.175
12. Durand, M. L., Calderwood, S. B., Weber, D. J., et al. Acute bacterial meningitis in adults. A review of 493 episodes. New England Journal of Medicine, 1993; 328(1): 21–28. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199301073280103

13. Sigurdardóttir, B., Björnsson, O. M., Jónsdóttir, K. E., et al. Acute bacterial meningitis in adults. A 20-year overview. Archives of Internal Medicine, 1997; 157(4): 425–430. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.157.4.425
14. Amarilyo, G., Alper, A., Ben-Tov, A., et al. Diagnostic accuracy of clinical symptoms and signs in children with meningitis. Pediatric Emergency Care, 2011; 27(3): 196–199. https://doi.org/10.1097/PEC.0b013e318217754f
15. Ward, M. A., Greenwood, T. M., Kumar, D. R., et al. Josef Brudzinski and Vladimir Mikhailovich Kernig: Signs for diagnosing meningitis. Clinical Medicine & Research, 2010; 8(1): 13–17. https://doi.org/10.3121/cmr.2010.935
16. Nakao, J. H., Jafri, F. N., Shah, K., et al. Jolt accentuation of headache and other clinical signs: Poor predictors of meningitis in adults. American Journal of Emergency Medicine, 2014; 32(1): 24–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2013.10.014
17. Thomas, K. E., Hasbun, R., Jekel, J., et al. The diagnostic accuracy of Kernig's sign, Brudzinski's sign, and nuchal rigidity in adults with suspected meningitis. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2002; 35(1): 46–52. https://doi.org/10.1086/340174
18. Uchihara, T., & Tsukagoshi, H. Jolt accentuation of headache: The most sensitive sign of CSF pleocytosis. Headache, 1991; 31(3): 167–171. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-4610.1991.hed3103167.x
19. Aronin, S. I., Peduzzi, P., & Quagliarello, V. J. Community-acquired bacterial meningitis: Risk stratification for adverse clinical outcome and effect of antibiotic timing. Annals of Internal Medicine, 1998; 129(11): 862–869. https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-129-11-199812010-00004
20. Proulx, N., Fréchette, D., Toye, B., et al. Delays in the administration of antibiotics are associated with mortality from adult acute bacterial meningitis. Quarterly Journal of Medicine, 2005; 98(4): 291–298. https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmed/hci043
21. Auburtin, M., Wolff, M., Charpentier, J., et al. Detrimental role of delayed antibiotic administration and penicillin-nonsusceptible strains in adult intensive care unit patients with pneumococcal meningitis: The PNEUMOREA prospective multicenter study. Critical Care Medicine, 2006; 34(11): 2758–2765. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.CCM.0000247192.58659.94
22. Michael, B., Menezes, B. F., Cunniffe, J., et al. Effect of delayed lumbar punctures on the diagnosis of acute bacterial meningitis in adults. Emergency Medicine Journal, 2010; 27(6): 433–438. https://doi.org/10.1136/emj.2010.097007
23. Van Crevel, H., Hijdra, A., & de Gans, J. Lumbar puncture and the risk of herniation: When should we first perform CT? Journal of Neurology, 2002; 249(2): 129–137. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415002-0591-5
24. Tunkel, A. R., Hartman, B. J., Kaplan, S. L., et al. Practice guidelines for the management of bacterial meningitis. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2004; 39(9): 1267–1284. https://doi.org/10.1086/425368
25. Glimaker, M., Johansson, B., Grindborg, O., et al. Adult bacterial meningitis: Earlier treatment and improved outcome following guideline revision promoting prompt lumbar puncture. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2015; 60(8): 1162–1169. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/civ104
26. van de Beek, D., de Gans, J., Spanjaard, L., et al. Clinical features and prognostic factors in adults with bacterial meningitis. New England Journal of Medicine, 2004; 351(18): 1849–1859. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa040845
27. Ray, P., Badarou-Acossi, G., Viallon, A., et al. Accuracy of the cerebrospinal fluid results in the diagnosis of bacterial meningitis. Emerging Infectious Diseases, 2007; 13(10): 1524–1530. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1310.061052
28. Tunkel, A. R., & Scheld, W. M. Acute bacterial meningitis: The role of the cerebrospinal fluid. Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 2007; 45(5): 1442–1448. https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02084-06
29. Zunt, J. R., & Wijdicks, E. F. The role of cerebrospinal fluid analysis in the diagnosis of bacterial meningitis. Neurology, 2003; 60(3): 415–420. https://doi.org/10.1212/01.WNL.0000047280.03776.99
30. Bjerre, J., Koch, J., & Gisselsson, J. The value of CSF analysis in the management of bacterial meningitis. Journal of Infection, 2003; 47(3): 201–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-4453(03)00211-2
31. Assicot, M., Gendrel, D., Carsin, H., et al. High serum procalcitonin concentrations in patients with sepsis and infection. Lancet, 1993; 341(8844): 515–518. https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736(93)90277-3
32. Schuetz, P., Müller, B., Christ-Crain, M., et al. Procalcitonin to initiate or discontinue antibiotics in acute respiratory tract infections. Evidence Based Child Health, 2013; 8(4): 1297–1371. https://doi.org/10.1002/ebch.1957
33. Nigrovic, L. E., Kuppermann, N., & Malley, R. Development and validation of a multivariable predictive model to distinguish bacterial from aseptic meningitis in children in the post-Haemophilus influenzae era. Pediatrics, 2002; 110(4): 712–719. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.110.4.712
34. Nigrovic, L. E., Kuppermann, N., Macias, C. G., et al. Clinical prediction rule for identifying children with cerebrospinal fluid pleocytosis at very low risk of bacterial meningitis. JAMA, 2007; 297(1): 52–60. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.297.1.52

35. Nigrovic, L. E., Malley, R., & Kuppermann, N. Meta-analysis of bacterial meningitis score validation studies. Archives of Disease in Childhood, 2012; 97(9): 799–805. https://doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2011-301473
36. Tauber, M. G., Khayam-Bashi, H., & Sande, M. A. Effects of ampicillin and corticosteroids on brain water content, cerebrospinal fluid pressure, and cerebrospinal fluid lactate levels in experimental pneumococcal meningitis. Journal of Infectious Diseases, 1985; 151(3): 528–534. https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/151.3.528
37. Brouwer, M. C., McIntyre, P., Prasad, K., et al. Corticosteroids for acute bacterial meningitis. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2013; 6: CD004405. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD004405.pub3
38. Steiner, I., & Benninger, F. Update on herpes virus infections of the nervous system. Current Neurology and Neuroscience Reports, 2013; 13(12): 414. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11910-013-0414-7
39. Solomon, T., Michael, B. D., Smith, P. E., et al. Management of suspected viral encephalitis in adults—Association of British Neurologists and British Infection Association National Guidelines. Journal of Infection, 2012; 64(4): 347–373. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2011.11.004
40. Johnson, R. T. Acute encephalitis. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 1996; 23(2): 219–224. https://doi.org/10.1093/clinids/23.2.219
41. Murthy, S. N. K., Faden, H. S., Cohen, M. E., et al. Acute disseminated encephalomyelitis in children. Pediatrics, 2002; 110(2 Pt 1): e21. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.110.2.e21
42. Granerod, J., Ambrose, H. E., Davies, N. W., et al. Causes of encephalitis and differences in their clinical presentations in England: A multicentre, population-based prospective study. Lancet Infectious Diseases, 2010; 10(12): 835–844. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(10)70222-8
43. Greenlee, J. E. Encephalitis and postinfectious encephalitis. Continuum (Minneapolis, Minn.), 2012; 18: 1271–1289. https://doi.org/10.1212/01.CON.0000427976.33159.2d
44. Whitley, R. J., & Lakeman, F. Herpes simplex virus infections of the central nervous system: Therapeutic and diagnostic considerations. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 1995; 20(2): 414–420. https://doi.org/10.1093/clinids/20.2.414
45. Grahn, A., & Studahl, M. Varicella-zoster virus infections of the central nervous system—Prognosis, diagnostics and treatment. Journal of Infection, 2015; 71(3): 281–293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2015.04.009
46. Koskiniemi, M., Rantalaiho, T., Piiparinen, H., et al. Infections of the central nervous system of suspected viral origin: A collaborative study from Finland. Journal of Neurovirology, 2001; 7(5): 400–408. https://doi.org/10.1080/135502801750174347
47. Whitley, R. J. Herpes simplex encephalitis: Clinical assessment. JAMA, 1982; 247(3): 317. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1982.03320300043020
48. Deresiewicz, R. L., Thaler, S. J., Hsu, L., et al. Clinical and neuroradiographic manifestations of eastern equine encephalitis. New England Journal of Medicine, 1997; 336(26): 1867–1874. https://doi.org/0.1056/NEJM199706263362604
49. Hayes, E. B., Sejvar, J. J., Zaki, S. R., et al. Virology, pathology, and clinical manifestations of West Nile virus disease. Emerging Infectious Diseases, 2005; 11(8): 1174–1179. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1108.041024
50. Whitley, R. J., & Gnann, J. W. Viral encephalitis: Familiar infections and emerging pathogens. Lancet, 2002; 359(9305): 507–513. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(02)07624-0
51. Domingues, R., Fink, M. C., Tsanaclis, A. M., et al. Diagnosis of herpes simplex encephalitis by magnetic resonance imaging and polymerase chain reaction assay of cerebrospinal fluid. Journal of Neurology, 1998; 157(2): 148–153. https://doi.org/10.1007/s004150050143
52. Ibitoye, R. T., Sarkar, P., & Rajbhandari, S. Pitfalls in the management of herpes simplex virus encephalitis. BMJ Case Reports, 2012; 2012. https://doi.org/10.1136/bcr-2012-007846
53. Sili, U., Kaya, A., Mert, A., et al. Herpes simplex virus encephalitis: Clinical manifestations, diagnosis and outcome in 106 adult patients. Journal of Clinical Virology, 2014; 60(2): 112–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2014.04.007
54. Raschilas, F., Wolff, M., Delatour, F., et al. Outcome of and prognostic factors for herpes simplex encephalitis in adult patients: Results of a multicenter study. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2002; 35(3): 254–260. https://doi.org/10.1086/341560
55. Poissy, J., Wolff, M., Dewilde, A., et al. Factors associated with delay to acyclovir administration in 184 patients with herpes simplex virus encephalitis. Clinical Microbiology and Infection, 2009; 15(6): 560–564. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2008.02728.x
56. Stehman, C. R., Buckley, R. G., DosSantos, F. L., et al. Bedside estimation of patient height for calculating ideal body weight in the emergency department. Journal of Emergency Medicine, 2011; 41(1): 97–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemermed.2009.03.014

دور خدمات الطوارئ، المسعفين، والصيادلة في التخفيف من التهابات الجهاز العصبي المركزي: رؤى من معلومات الصحة.

الملخص:

الخلفية :تشكل التهابات الجهاز العصبي المركزي، مثل التهاب السحايا البكتيري، الفيروس ي، والفطري، تحديات كبيرة في التشخيص والعلاج لخدمات الطوارئ الطبية(EMS) ، المسعفين، والصيادلة. يُعد تحديد وإدارة هذه الالتهابات مبكرًا أمرًا حاسمًا لتحسين نتائج المرض ى، حيث إن الأعراض غالبًا ما تتداخل مع حالات أخرى وقد تتطور بسرعة.

الهدف :تهدف هذه المراجعة إلى توضيح أدوار خدمات الطوارئ، المسعفين، والصيادلة في تحديد وإدارة وعلاج التهابات الجهاز العصبي المركزي، مع تسليط الضوء على كيفية دعم معلومات الصحة لهذه الأدوار.

الطر ق :قمنا بإجراء مراجعة شاملة للأدبيات الحالية والإرشادات السريرية المتعلقة بالتهابات الجهاز العصبي المركزي، بما في ذلك التهاب السحايا والتهاب الدماغ. قمنا بدراسة العرض السريري، التقييم التشخيص ي، واستراتيجيات الإدارة التي يعتمدها خدمات الطوارئ والمسعفون، ودور الصيادلة في ضمان العلاج الفعال.

النتائج :تظهر التهابات الجهاز العصبي المركزي مجموعة من الأعراض، مما يجعل التشخيص المبكر صعبًا. العلامات السريرية التقليدية مثل الحمى وتيبس الرقبة تمتلك حساسية متباينة. تعزز أدوات معلومات الصحة، بما في ذلك السجلات الصحية الإلكترونية وأنظمة دعم القرار، دقة التشخيص من خلال دمج تاريخ المريض والأعراض الحالية. تلعب خدمات الطوارئ والمسعفون دورًا حيويًا في الكشف المبكر والتدخل الفوري، بينما يضمن الصيادلة استخدام العلاجات بالمضادات الحيوية والفيروسية المناسبة، مما يُحسن نتائج العلاج.

الخلاصة :يتطلب الإدارة الفعالة لالتهابات الجهاز العصبي المركزي نهجًا منسقًا يشمل خدمات الطوارئ، المسعفين، والصيادلة. تعزز أدوات معلومات الصحة بشكل كبير من عمليات التشخيص والعلاج، مما يؤدي إلى تحسين رعاية المرض ى ونتائجهم. تعتبر التطورات المستمرة في هذه التقنيات والممارسات أساسية لتحسين إدارة التهابات الجهاز العصبي المركز ي .

الكلمات المفتاحية :التهابات الجهاز العصبي المركزي، التهاب السحايا، التهاب الدماغ، خدمات الطوارئ الطبية، المسعفين، الصيادلة، معلومات الصحة، أدوات التشخيص، إدارة العلاج.