

Correspondence

Reply

A. Wesley Burks, MD^a
Stacie M. Jones, MD^b

To the Editor:

We appreciate the careful reading of our article by Drs Salmun and Cavanaugh.¹ In our article we stated that the Auvi-Q Auto-Injector “uses new technology to reduce errors in delivery” of epinephrine.² In one of the peer-reviewed studies we referenced,³ more participants correctly followed all device instructions for the Auvi-Q prototypes than for EpiPen or TwinJect, and we believe this supports our statement. Drs Salmun and Cavanaugh correctly point out that the voice prompt in the Auvi-Q prototypes did malfunction multiple times. Data comparing the marketed product Auvi-Q with EpiPen and TwinJect are not available in the published literature but would be of interest. As physicians, we are glad there are devices that provide epinephrine to patients at risk for life-threatening reactions and appreciate the efforts of all who develop and produce them.

From ^athe Department of Pediatrics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, and ^bthe Department of Pediatrics, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences and Arkansas Children’s Hospital, Little Rock, Ark. E-mail: wesley.burks@unc.edu.

REFERENCES

1. Salmun L, Cavanaugh PF Jr. Design of the EpiPen Auto-Injector. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2013;■■■:■■■.
2. Jones SM, Burks AW. The changing CARE for patients with food allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2013;131:3-11.
3. Guerlain S, Hugine A, Wang L. A comparison of 4 epinephrine autoinjector delivery systems: usability and patient preference. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 2010;104:172-7.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2013.04.022>