

Usage prevalence of angioedema patient-reported outcome measures: Results from the UCARE and ACARE PROMUSE study



Ivan Cherez-Ojeda, MD^{a,b}, Jean Bousquet, MD^{c,d}, Ana Giménez-Arnau, MD, PhD^e, Kiran Godse, MD, PhD^f, Dorota Krasowska, MD, PhD^g, Joanna Bartosińska, MD, PhD^{g,h}, Paulina Szczepanik-Kuřak, MD, PhD^g, Bartłomiej Wawrzycki, MD, PhD^g, Pavel Kolkhir, MD^{c,d}, Anastasiia Allenova, MD, PhDⁱ, Andrey Allenov, MD, PhD^{j,k,l}, Sergey Tkachenko, MD, PhD^m, Natasa Teovska Mitrevska, MD^{n,o}, Dragan Mijakoski, MD, PhD^{p,q}, Sasho Stoleski, MD, PhD^{p,q}, Marta Kolacinska-Flont, MD, PhD^r, Izabela Kuprys-Lipinska, MD, PhD^r, Joanna Molinska, MS^r, Alicja Kasperska-Zajac, MD, PhD^s, Magdalena Zajac, MD^s, Mateusz Zamłyński, MD, PhD^s, Florin Mihaltan, MD^t, Ruxandra Ulmeanu, MD, PhD, FCCP^u, Anna Zalewska-Janowska, MD, PhD^v, Katarzyna Tomaszewska, MD, PhD^v, Mona Al-Ahmad, MD^w, Maryam Ali Al-Nesf, MD, MS, ABHS^x, Tayseer Ibrahim, MD, MS^x, Sami Aqel, MD^x, David Pesqué, MD^{y,z}, Mónica Rodríguez-González, MD^{aa}, Guillermo Hideo Wakida-Kuzunoki, MD^{ab}, German D. Ramon, MD^{ac}, Gonzalo N. Ramon, MD^{ac}, Sophia Neisinger, MD^{c,d}, Hanna Bonnekoh, MD^{c,d,bh}, Maia Rukhadze, MD^{ad}, Maryam Khoshkhui, MD^{ae}, Daria Fomina, MD^{af,ag}, Désirée Larenas-Linnemann, MD^{ah}, Mitja Košnik, MD^{ai,aj}, Rabia Oztas Kara, MD^{ak}, Chrystopherson Gengyny Caballero López, MD^{al}, Qiang Liu, MD^{am}, Juan Carlos Ivancevich, MD^{an}, Lius Felipe Ensina, MD, MS, PhD^{ao}, Nelson Rosario, MD, PhD^{ap}, Violeta Kvedariene, MD, PhD^{aq,ar}, Moshe Ben-Shoshan, MD, MS^{as}, Roberta Fachini Jardim Criado, MD, MS^{at}, Andrea Bauer, MD, MPH^{au}, Annia Cherez, MD^{b,av}, Sofia Cherez, MD^{b,aw}, Herberto Chong-Neto, MD, PhD^{ax}, Maria Isabel Rojo-Gutierrez, MD^{ay}, Michael Rudenko, MD, PhD, FAAAAI^{az}, José Ignacio Larco Sousa, MD^{ba}, Aleksandra Lesiak, MD^{bb}, Edgar Matos, MD^{bc}, Ivan Tinoco, MD^{bd}, Carolina Crespo Shijin, MD^{a,b}, Romina Hinostroza Logroño, MD^{a,b}

Juan C. Sagñay, MD^{a,b}, Marco Faytong-Haro, MA^{b,be,bf,bg}, Karla Robles-Velasco, MD^{a,b}, Torsten Zuberbier, MD^{c,d}, and Marcus Maurer, MD^{c,d}

Clinical Implications

Despite the potential to enhance patient care, patient-reported outcome measures are underutilized in angioedema management. National/international medical societies should promote the widespread adoption of patient-reported outcome measures and assist physicians to overcome barriers to their use.

Angioedema manifests as self-limited, localized, and transient swellings of the skin or mucosal tissues due to a loss of vascular integrity. This allows fluid to move into tissues such as the face, larynx, genitals, and bowel wall.¹ The global lifetime prevalence of acquired and hereditary angioedema is 7.4%² and 0.002%,³ respectively. Notably, angioedema is the third most common skin condition in emergency medicine.⁴

The burden of angioedema includes poor quality of life, mental issues, and reduced work and school productivity, leading to substantial direct and indirect expenses.⁵ Patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) assess disease burden, activity, and control.⁶ The PROMs are also used to assess the response to treatments in routine clinical practice and help to evaluate innovative therapies under development in clinical trials. Moreover, the integration of PROMs will promote cooperative decision making among health care practitioners and patients, eventually improving patient satisfaction and optimizing treatment outcomes.⁶ In angioedema, the 3 most widely used PROMs are the Angioedema Activity Score (AAS),⁷ the Angioedema Quality of Life Questionnaire (AE-QoL),⁸ and the Angioedema Control Test (AECT).⁹ These tools are validated,⁷⁻⁹ recommended by current guidelines, and freely available in many languages and country versions, yet the rate of their use in angioedema management is currently unknown.

To address this gap, the global networks of Urticaria Centers of Reference and Excellence (UCAREs) and Angioedema Centers of Reference and Excellence (ACAREs) performed a cross-sectional study, PROMUSE (institutional review board approval no. HCK-CEISH-21-002), to assess which and how often PROMs are used by physicians who treat patients with angioedema, and to identify what physicians perceive as barriers to the use of PROMs. In total, 370 angioedema-treating physicians from 39 countries completed the PROMUSE 53-item questionnaire.

Of 370 physicians who treat patients with angioedema, only 32 (9%) used all 3 PROMs—the AAS, the AE-QoL, and the AECT. Two (either AAS+AECT, AAS+AE-QoL, or AE-QoL+AECT) and 1 (either AAS, AECT or AE-QoL) of these PROMs were used by 82 (22%) and 105 (28%) of 370 physicians, and 151 physicians (41%) did not use any of them. The AAS was the most used angioedema PROM (48%; n = 180),

TABLE I. Demographic characteristics of participants included in the analysis (n = 370)

Variables	n (%)
Male	134 (36.2)
Female	236 (63.8)
Specialist	309 (83.5)
Age group	
20–29	44 (11.9)
30–39	132 (35.7)
40–49	84 (22.7)
50–59	69 (18.6)
60+	41 (11.1)
Type of consultation	
Public practice	152 (41.1)
Private practice	67 (18.1)
Both public and private	151 (40.8)
Specialty	
Family medicine	21 (5.7)
Pediatrics	58 (15.7)
Allergist	163 (44.1)
Dermatologist	132 (35.7)
Other	39 (10.5)
Years being a specialist	
1–9	146 (39.5)
10–19	109 (29.5)
20–29	60 (16.2)
30+	55 (14.9)
Reasons to use PROMs	
To monitor disease control	353 (95.4)
To monitor disease severity	347 (93.8)
To facilitate decision making	332 (89.7)
To monitor performance and therapeutic approach	329 (88.9)
To improve efficiency of consultation	296 (80.0)
To facilitate communication with patients	275 (74.3)
For research	244 (65.9)
To facilitate communication across different health care sectors	225 (60.8)
Other	38 (10.3)
Barriers to the use PROMs	
Time constraints	295 (79.7)
Lack of integration into clinical systems	222 (60.0)
Patients dislike questionnaires	220 (59.5)
Not mandated to complete	201 (54.3)
Not available for certain age groups	192 (51.9)
Sufficient understanding of the disease without PROMs	170 (45.9)
Not available in the native language of my patients	149 (40.3)
Uncertainty about reliability	141 (38.1)
Lack of confidence in interpreting	124 (33.5)
Too complicated to fill in	124 (33.5)
Too complicated to evaluate/score	121 (32.7)
Not suitable for obtaining the information I need	101 (27.3)
Feel uncomfortable	112 (30.3)
Perceived as additional cost	90 (24.3)
Constrain doctor-patient relationship	70 (18.9)

followed by the AE-QoL (43%; n = 161) and the AECT (28%; n = 102). Of physicians who use the AAS, the AE-QoL, and the AECT, only 19%, 19%, and 23%, respectively, reported using it always—that is, in all of their patients (Table I and Table E1; available in this article's Online Repository at www.jaci-inpractice.org).

Allergists, compared with other specialties, used the AAS, AE-QoL, and/or the AECT more often (n = 163, 44%, $P = .039$), and of 163 allergists, 53% (n = 86), 26% (n = 42), and 12% (n = 20) used 1, 2, and 3 PROMs, respectively. Multivariate regression showed that allergists use PROMs 4.3 times more often than other specialties ($P < .05$; Table II). Furthermore, clinicians who concurrently practiced in both public and private settings had a 3.6-fold higher use of angioedema PROMs than those who worked in either a public or a private setting ($P < .05$). Female physicians were more likely to use angioedema PROMs than male physicians (44% vs 33%), but this difference was not statistically significant. Physicians with less than 20 years of specialty experience were 60% less likely to use 1 or more PROMs for angioedema (odds ratio 0.409).

The 3 most common reasons for using angioedema PROMs, reported by 90% or more of PROM-using physicians, were monitoring disease control, assessing disease activity, and guiding decision making (Table I). The most commonly perceived barriers, reported by more than 50% of physicians who use PROMs, were time restrictions (80%), patients' reluctance to complete questionnaires (60%), lack of PROM integration in health care systems (60%), that PROMs are not mandatory (54%), and unavailability for certain age groups (52%; Table I). Multivariate logistic regression showed that younger specialists found "time constraints" to be a challenge more often than older ones ($P < .05$) (Table II). Specialists were 6.5 times more likely to perceive "time constraints" as a barrier versus nonspecialists. Physicians who practice in both public and private settings were 56% less likely to cite "patients disliking questionnaires" as a barrier than those who exclusively work in private or public institutions ($P < .05$).

Our findings demonstrate that PROMs are considerably underused in the management of patients with angioedema, even though many participating physicians practice in highly specialized allergy and dermatology facilities. Notably, there are several free access tools available, including BiblioPRO (www.bibliopro.org) and Moxie (www.moxie-gmbh.de), to access and download the angioedema PROMs discussed here. Also, for mast cell-mediated angioedema, the CRUSE app (<https://cruse-control.com/>) incorporates the AAS and the AECT.

Our study lays the groundwork for identifying the gaps in PROM usage in angioedema, a disorder that substantially impacts patients' quality of life. We recommend that medical societies consider these findings to overcome barriers and enhance the provision of continuing medical education on PROMs. Furthermore, they should also consider incorporating additional objective biomarkers into PROMs to optimize the monitoring and follow-up tools for this condition.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the study participants and Leonard Lionnet, PhD, for medical writing assistance.

The author(s) did not use any AI programs during the preparation of this work.

TABLE II. Multivariate logistic regression: correlates to barriers of PROM use (n = 370)

Variables	Use of PROMs in angioedema Odds ratio (SE)				PROM barriers in angioedema Odds ratio (SE)			
	PROMs used	To monitor disease control	To monitor disease severity	To facilitate decision making	Time constraints	Lack of integration into clinical systems	Patients dislike questionnaires	Sufficient understanding of the disease without PROMs
Female (reference: male)	1.161 (0.479)	0.829 (0.479)	0.669 (0.378)	0.691 (0.269)	1.192 (0.344)	0.814 (0.191)	0.906 (0.217)	0.907 (0.215)
Age group (reference: 20–29 y)								
30–39	1.102 (0.585)	1.722 (1.671)	0.228 (0.255)	0.172 (0.186)	0.240** (0.161)	0.784 (0.310)	1.669 (0.687)	1.003 (0.393)
40–49	0.808 (0.595)	0.589 (0.652)	0.0690** (0.0873)	0.214 (0.254)	0.169** (0.131)	0.732 (0.355)	1.625 (0.812)	0.874 (0.426)
50–59	1.289 (1.322)	2.207 (3.419)	0.653 (1.157)	0.365 (0.481)	0.105** (0.0929)	0.711 (0.427)	1.053 (0.645)	1.398 (0.856)
60+	0.249 (0.392)	4.610 (9.433)	0.0628 (0.125)	0.253 (0.376)	0.0395*** (0.0430)	0.232* (0.189)	1.177 (0.925)	2.235 (1.556)
Type of consultation (reference: public practice)								
Private practice	0.678 (0.376)	0.460 (0.318)	1.358 (0.833)	0.550 (0.272)	0.882 (0.358)	0.819 (0.257)	0.673 (0.220)	0.813 (0.261)
Both public and private	0.739 (0.306)	0.754 (0.498)	3.550** (2.257)	0.739 (0.311)	0.924 (0.295)	1.023 (0.258)	0.436*** (0.114)	0.915 (0.233)
Type of physician (reference: nonspecialists)								
Specialist	1.373 (1.121)	0.487 (0.565)	2.937 (2.625)	2.165 (1.691)	6.475*** (3.873)	1.148 (0.533)	0.615 (0.304)	0.676 (0.320)
Specialty (reference: physicians outside of the specialties that follow)								
Family medicine	0.468 (0.551)	2.163 (2.715)	2.569 (3.153)	2.694 (2.972)	3.148 (3.380)	1.317 (0.697)	1.508 (0.853)	1.318 (0.682)
Pediatrics	1.081 (0.674)	1.943 (1.752)	0.490 (0.325)	3.372* (2.227)	2.462* (1.204)	0.998 (0.340)	1.396 (0.487)	2.291** (0.783)
Allergist	0.974 (0.599)	4.307* (3.729)	2.639 (1.745)	0.491 (0.267)	0.271*** (0.113)	0.882 (0.276)	0.806 (0.259)	0.405*** (0.133)
Dermatologist	0.833 (0.560)	3.141 (2.973)	1.796 (1.390)	1.036 (0.554)	0.358** (0.146)	0.719 (0.242)	0.867 (0.300)	0.635 (0.223)
Other†	0.756 (0.245)	0.885 (0.811)	0.156*** (0.108)	1.147 (0.777)	0.512 (0.246)	1.227 (0.478)	2.654** (1.113)	
Years being a specialist (reference: ≤9)								
10–19	0.407* (0.221)	0.569 (0.460)	0.906 (0.644)	0.729 (0.394)	0.974 (0.409)	0.862 (0.276)	0.711 (0.236)	1.078 (0.351)
20+	0.447 (0.396)	0.671 (0.770)	0.767 (0.809)	0.407 (0.327)	1.796 (1.131)	1.003 (0.488)	0.711 (0.354)	0.693 (0.351)

SE, Standard error.

* $P < .1$; ** $P < .05$; *** $P < .01$.

†"Other" includes an extensive range of specialties, such as Gastroenterologists, Emergency Medicine Physicians, Hematologists, Internal Medicine Specialists, showcasing the diverse array of fields and expertise within the medical profession.

- ^aUniversidad Espíritu Santo, Samborondón, Ecuador
- ^bRespiraLab Research Group, Department of Allergy, Immunology & Pulmonology, Guayaquil, Ecuador
- ^cCharité—Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Institute of Allergology, Berlin, Germany
- ^dFraunhofer Institute for Translational Medicine and Pharmacology (ITMP), Allergology and Immunology, Berlin, Germany
- ^eDermatology Department, Hospital del Mar Research Institute, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain
- ^fDepartment of Dermatology, D. Y. Patil University School of Medicine, Navi Mumbai, India
- ^gDepartment of Dermatology, Venereology and Pediatric Dermatology, Medical University of Lublin, Lublin, Poland
- ^hDepartment of Cosmetology and Aesthetic Medicine, Medical University of Lublin, Lublin, Poland
- ⁱLaboratory of Immune-Mediated Skin Diseases, Institute of Regenerative Medicine, Biomedical Science & Technology Park, I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University), Moscow, Russian Federation
- ^jInstitute for Leadership and Health Management, I. M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University), Moscow, Russian Federation
- ^kState Budgetary Healthcare Institution of the City of Moscow, "City Polyclinic No. 2 10 of the Department of Health of the City of Moscow," Moscow, Russian Federation
- ^lFederal State Budgetary Scientific Institution, "N. A. Semashko National Research Institute of Public Health," Moscow, Russian Federation
- ^mRussian Medical Academy of Continuous Professional Education of the Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russian Federation
- ⁿDermatology Department, Remedika General Hospital, Skopje, Republic of North Macedonia
- ^oInternational Balkan University (IBU), Skopje, Republic of North Macedonia
- ^pInstitute of Occupational Health of RNM-Skopje, Skopje, Republic of North Macedonia
- ^qFaculty of Medicine, Ss. Cyril and Methodius, University of Skopje, Skopje, Republic of North Macedonia
- ^rDepartment of Internal Medicine, Asthma and Allergy, Barlicki Memorial Hospital, Medical University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland
- ^sEuropean Center for Diagnosis and Treatment of Urticaria/Angioedema (GAZLEN UCARE/ACARE Network) & Department of Clinical Allergology and Urticaria, Medical University of Silesia, Silesia, Poland
- ^tNational Institute of Pneumology, Bucharest, Romania
- ^uInstitute of Pneumology, "Marius Nasta," Bucharest, Romania
- ^vMedical University of Lodz, Chair of Clinical Immunology and Rheumatology, Department of Psychodermatology, Lodz, Poland
- ^wMicrobiology Department, College of Medicine, Kuwait University, Kuwait City, Kuwait
- ^xAllergy and Immunology Division, Medicine Department, Hamad Medical Corporation, Doha, Qatar
- ^yDepartment of Dermatology, Hospital del Mar, Barcelona, Spain
- ^zUniversitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB), Barcelona, Spain
- ^{aa}Hospital Español de México, Ciudad de México, Mexico
- ^{ab}Colegio Mexicano de Pediatras Especialistas en Inmunología Clínica y Alergia, México
- ^{ac}Instituto de Alergia e Inmunología del Sur, GAZLEN UCARE/ADCARE/ACARE Center, Bahía Blanca, Argentina
- ^{ad}Center Allergy & Immunology/Geomed Teaching University, Faculty of Medicine, Tbilisi, Georgia
- ^{ae}Allergy Research Center, Mashhad University of Medical Science (MUMS), Mashhad, Iran
- ^{af}Moscow Practical and Research Center of Allergy and Immunology, Clinical City Hospital, Moscow, Russian Federation
- ^{ag}Moscow Department of Clinical Immunology and Allergology, Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University, Astana Medical University, Moscow, Russian Federation
- ^{ah}Centro de Excelencia en Asma y Alergia, Hospital Médica Sur, Mexico City, Mexico
- ^{ai}University Clinic of Respiratory and Allergic Diseases, Golnik, Slovenia Medical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
- ^{aj}Medical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
- ^{ak}Department of Dermatology, Sakarya University Faculty of Medicine, Sakarya, Turkey
- ^{al}Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Hospital Universitario de Puebla, Servicio de Alergia e Inmunología Clínica, Puebla, Puebla, México
- ^{am}Second Hospital of Hebei Medical University, Shijiazhuang City, Hebei Province, China
- ^{an}Servicio de Alergia e Inmunología, Clínica Santa Isabel, Buenos Aires, Argentina
- ^{ao}Division of Allergy, Clinical Immunology and Rheumatology, Department of Pediatrics, Federal University of São Paulo and CPAAlpha Clinical Research Center, São Paulo, Brazil
- ^{ap}Urticaria Center of Reference and Excellence (UCARE), Federal University of Paraná, Rua General Carneiro, Curitiba, Brazil
- ^{aq}Institute of Biomedical Sciences, Department of Pathology, Faculty of Medicine, Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania
- ^{ar}Institute of Clinical Medicine, Clinic of Chest Diseases, Immunology and Allergology, Faculty of Medicine, Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania
- ^{as}Division of Allergy, Immunology and Dermatology, Department of Pediatrics, McGill University Health Center, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
- ^{at}Faculdade de Medicina do ABC (FMABC), Santo André (SP), Brazil
- ^{au}Department of Dermatology, University Allergy Center, University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Technical University, Dresden, Germany
- ^{av}Department of Dermatology, Venerology, and Allergology, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany
- ^{aw}Gemeinschaftspraxis PD, Dr. Jung & Kollegen, Krämpferstr. Erfurt, Germany
- ^{ax}Department of Pediatrics, Hospital de Clínicas, Federal University of Paraná (UFPR), Curitiba, Brazil
- ^{ay}Hospital Juarez de Mexico, Mexico
- ^{az}London Allergy and Immunology Centre, London, United Kingdom
- ^{ba}Allergy Unit, Clinica San Felipe, Lima, Peru
- ^{bb}Department of Dermatology, Pediatric Dermatology and Dermatological Oncology, Medical University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland
- ^{bc}Instituto Nacional de Salud del Niño, Lima, Peru
- ^{bd}Centro de Alergia Tinoco, Machala, Ecuador
- ^{be}Universidad Estatal de Milagro, Cda. Universitaria "Dr. Romulo Minchala Murillo", Guayas, Milagro, Ecuador
- ^{bf}Sociology and Demography Department, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa
- ^{bg}Ecuadorian Development Research Laboratory, Daule, Guayas, Ecuador
- ^{bh}Institute of Allergology, Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Corporate Member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany

This study was funded by UCARE.

Conflicts of interest: A. Giménez-Arnau is/was a speaker for Almirall, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Avene, Celldex, Escient Pharmaceuticals, Genentech, GlaxoSmithKline (GSK), Instituto Carlos III- FEDER, Leo Pharma, Menarini, Novartis, Sanofi-Regeneron, Thermo Fisher Scientific, and Uriach Pharma/Neucor; is/was an advisor of Almirall, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Avene, Celldex, Escient Pharmaceuticals, Genentech, GlaxoSmithKline (GSK), Instituto Carlos III- FEDER, Leo Pharma, Menarini, Novartis, Sanofi-Regeneron, Thermo Fisher Scientific, and Uriach Pharma/Neucor; has received funding from Almirall, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Avene, Celldex, Escient Pharmaceuticals, Genentech, GlaxoSmithKline (GSK), Instituto Carlos III- FEDER, Leo Pharma, Menarini, Novartis, Sanofi-Regeneron, Thermo Fisher Scientific, and Uriach Pharma/Neucor. P. Kolchir is/was advisor from Novartis, Roche, and ValenzaBio, outside of submitted work. A. Allenova is a speaker for Novartis (outside of submitted work). M. Kolacinska-Flont is a speaker for Novartis. I. Kuprys-Lipinska is a speaker for Novartis, AstraZeneca, and GSK. H. Bonnekoh is/was advisory board from AbbVie, Intercept Pharma, Novartis, Sanofi-Aventis, and Valenza Bio Inc., outside the submitted work. J. C. Ivancevich is/was advisor for Laboratorios Casasco, Abbott Ecuador, Laboratorios Bago Bolivia, and Faes Farma. L. F. Ensina is/was speaker for Novartis and Sanofi. V. Kvedariene is/was advisor for Norameda and Berlin Chemie Menarini, outside the submitted work. M. Ben-Shoshan is/was advisor for Novartis and Sanofi. R. F. J. Criado is/was speaker for Takeda, Novartis, Sanofi, and Pfizer; is/was advisor for Novartis, Lilly, Abbvie, and Pfizer; and has received research funding from Takeda, Novartis, Sanofi, and Pfizer. M. Maurer is/was recently speaker for Allakos, Alvotech, Amgen, Aquestive, Aralez, AstraZeneca, Astria, Bayer, BioCryst, Blueprint, Celldex, Celltrion, Centogene, CSL Behring, Evoimmune, GSK, Ipsen, Kalvista, Kyowa Kirin, Leo Pharma, Lilly, Menarini, Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma, Moxie, Noucor, Novartis, Orion Biotechnology, Pharvaris, Resonance Medicine, Sanofi/Regeneron, Septerna, Takeda, Teva, Trial Form Support International AB, Third HarmonicBio, Valenza Bio, Yuhan Corporation, and Zurabio; is/was advisor for Allakos, Alvotech, Amgen, Aquestive, Aralez, AstraZeneca, Astria, Bayer, BioCryst, Blueprint, Celldex, Celltrion, Centogene, CSL Behring, Evoimmune, GSK, Ipsen, Kalvista, Kyowa Kirin, Leo Pharma, Lilly, Menarini, Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma, Moxie, Noucor, Novartis, Orion Biotechnology, Pharvaris, Resonance Medicine, Sanofi/Regeneron, Septerna, Takeda, Teva, Trial Form Support International AB, Third HarmonicBio, Valenza Bio, Yuhan Corporation, and Zurabio; has received research funding from Allakos, Alvotech, Amgen, Aquestive, Aralez, AstraZeneca, Astria, Bayer, BioCryst, Blueprint, Celldex, Celltrion, Centogene, CSL Behring, Evoimmune, GSK, Ipsen, Kalvista, Kyowa Kirin, Leo Pharma, Lilly, Menarini, Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma, Moxie, Noucor, Novartis, Orion Biotechnology, Pharvaris, Resonance Medicine, Sanofi/Regeneron,

Septerna, Takeda, Teva, Trial Form Support International AB, Third HarmonicBio, Valenza Bio, Yuhan Corporation, and Zurabio.

The rest of the authors declare that they have no relevant conflicts of interest.

Received for publication February 12, 2024; revised April 29, 2024; accepted for publication April 30, 2024.

Available online May 10, 2024.

Corresponding author: Ivan Cherez-Ojeda, MD, Universidad Espiritu Santo, Km. 2.5 via Samborondon 0901952, Samborondon, Ecuador; Respiralab Research Group, Av. 9na Oeste y Av. San Jorge, Guayaquil, Ecuador. E-mail: ivancherrez@gmail.com; Or: Marcus Maurer, MD, Charité—Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Institute of Allergology, Hindenburgdamm 30, 12203 Berlin, Germany. E-mail: marcus.maurer@charite.de

2213-2198

© 2024 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaip.2024.04.056>

REFERENCES

- Holguín-Gómez LM, Vásquez-Ochoa LA, Cardona R. Angioedema [in Spanish]. *Rev Alerg Mex* 2016;63:373-84.
- Madsen F, Attermann J, Linneberg A. Epidemiology of non-hereditary angioedema. *Acta Derm Venereol* 2012;92:475-9.
- Cicardi M, Aberer W, Banerji A, Bas M, Bernstein JA, Bork K, et al. Classification, diagnosis, and approach to treatment for angioedema: consensus report from the Hereditary Angioedema International Working Group. *Allergy* 2014;69:602-16.
- Demirel Ögüt N, Gülseren D, Yalçın-Armağan B, Akdoğan N, Günaydn SD, Elçin G, et al. Dermatology consultation requests from a university hospital's pediatric and adult emergency departments: a 5-year retrospective analysis. *Am J Emerg Med* 2022;53:112-7.
- Caballero T, Prior N. Burden of illness and quality-of-life measures in angioedema conditions. *Immunol Allergy Clin North Am* 2017;37:597-616.
- Brix ATH, Boysen HB, Weller K, Caballero T, Bygum A. Patient-reported outcome measures for angioedema: a literature review. *Acta Derm Venereol* 2021;101:adv00456.
- Weller K, Groffik A, Magerl M, Tohme N, Martus P, Krause K, et al. Development, validation, and initial results of the Angioedema Activity Score. *Allergy* 2013;68:1185-92.
- Weller K, Groffik A, Magerl M, Tohme N, Martus P, Krause K, et al. Development and construct validation of the Angioedema Quality of Life Questionnaire. *Allergy* 2012;67:1289-98.
- Weller K, Donoso T, Magerl M, Aygören-Pürsün E, Staubach P, Martinez-Saguer I, et al. Validation of the Angioedema Control Test (AECT)—a patient-reported outcome instrument for assessing angioedema control. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2020;8:2050-2057.e4.

ONLINE REPOSITORY

TABLE E1. Participating countries included in the analysis
(n = 370)

Participating countries	n (%)
Albania	1 (0.3)
Argentina	21 (5.7)
Austria	2 (0.5)
Brazil	11 (3.0)
Bulgaria	1 (0.3)
Burundi	1 (0.3)
Canada	7 (1.9)
Chile	1 (0.3)
China	3 (0.8)
Colombia	3 (0.8)
Denmark	2 (0.5)
Ecuador	45 (12.2)
Egypt	1 (0.3)
Georgia	17 (4.6)
Germany	29 (7.8)
Greece	1 (0.3)
India	12 (3.2)
Iran	11 (3.0)
Israel	1 (0.3)
Italy	6 (1.6)
Kuwait	13 (3.5)
Lebanon	1 (0.3)
Lithuania	3 (0.8)
Malaysia	1 (0.3)
Mexico	10 (2.7)
North Macedonia	18 (4.9)
Peru	3 (0.8)
Poland	61 (16.5)
Portugal	2 (0.5)
Qatar	7 (1.9)
Russia	26 (7.0)
Slovenia	11 (3.0)
South Sudan	1 (0.3)
Spain	28 (7.6)
Switzerland	1 (0.3)
Turkey	3 (0.8)
Ukraine	1 (0.3)
United Kingdom	2 (0.5)
United States	2 (0.5)