Communication

Advancements in Antivenom Therapy: Historical Perspectives, Current Challenges, and Ongoing Clinical Trials

Luis Alejandro Roque *

Posted Date: 16 June 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202506.0389.v2

Keywords: Snakebite envenomation; antivenom therapy; recombinant antivenom; monoclonal antibodies; venom immunology; neglected tropical diseases; polyclonal antibodies; clinical trials; toxinology

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0389.v2

Communication

Advancements in Antivenom Therapy: Historical Perspectives, Current Challenges, and Ongoing Clinical Trials

Luis Alejandro Roque

lroque@med.miami.edu

Abstract: Snakebite envenomation remains a severe global health burden, particularly in impoverished, rural, and tropical regions where healthcare resources are sparse. Despite over 125 years of progress in antivenom therapy, numerous obstacles persist related to efficacy, specificity, cost, and availability. Conventional antivenoms, although life-saving, are associated with significant drawbacks including species specificity and adverse immunologic reactions. This review explores the historical milestones in antivenom development, discusses current therapeutic limitations, highlights novel innovations through biotechnological approaches, and presents a list of ongoing clinical trials that aim to revolutionize the field. It emphasizes the pressing need for improved therapeutics and the critical role of translational research in mitigating the global impact of snakebite envenomation.

Keywords: snakebite envenomation; antivenom therapy; recombinant antivenom; monoclonal antibodies; venom immunology; neglected tropical diseases; polyclonal antibodies; clinical trials; toxinology

1. Introduction

Snakebite envenomation remains one of the most underrecognized and underfunded public health crises in the modern era, despite its classification as a high-priority neglected tropical disease (NTD) by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2017 [1]. This categorization underscores the urgent need for expanded research, therapeutic innovation, and coordinated policy interventions. Globally, it is estimated that more than 5.4 million snakebites occur each year, resulting in up to 2.7 million cases of envenomation [5]. Of these, approximately 81,000 to 138,000 result in death, while an additional 400,000 individuals experience permanent disabilities, such as blindness, limb amputations, or disfigurement [5]. The actual burden is likely even higher, as many cases go unreported due to inadequate surveillance systems and the prevalence of traditional or informal medical care in affected regions [4].

The epidemiology of snakebite envenomation reveals a pronounced geographical and socioeconomic disparity. The majority of envenomation cases occur in sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia (particularly India, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka), Southeast Asia, and Latin America—regions characterized by a high density of venomous snake species and limited access to modern healthcare services [4,5]. Within these areas, the most vulnerable populations are impoverished agricultural laborers, herders, hunters, and children, who are frequently exposed to snake habitats during their daily activities. Rural isolation, deficient transportation infrastructure, and economic constraints often delay or prevent victims from receiving timely medical treatment. Consequently, snakebite envenomation is both a biomedical emergency and a disease of inequity, mirroring broader systemic failures in health care delivery and resource allocation [4,5].

The clinical course of snakebite envenomation varies significantly based on the offending species and the composition of its venom, which may contain neurotoxins, hemotoxins, myotoxins,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0389.v2

cardiotoxins, or cytotoxins, often in complex mixtures [5]. Envenomation can lead to rapid-onset systemic manifestations such as hypotension, coagulopathy, renal failure, neuromuscular paralysis, and extensive local tissue necrosis. Without prompt administration of effective antivenom, the risk of irreversible organ damage or death increases dramatically [5]. Compounding this challenge, diagnostic capabilities to identify the envenoming species are frequently absent in rural clinics, further complicating clinical decision-making [9].

Treatment status worldwide remains suboptimal. The mainstay of therapy is the administration of antivenom derived from the immunized plasma of horses or sheep, which contains polyclonal antibodies capable of neutralizing venom components [7]. However, the efficacy of such preparations is often geographically limited to the venom profiles of specific snake populations used during the immunization process [7–9]. In Africa and Asia, polyclonal antivenoms often lack adequate species coverage or exhibit poor cross-reactivity [5,7,9]. Adverse reactions, such as early anaphylaxis or late-onset serum sickness, are relatively common due to the xenogeneic nature of these biologics [7,12]. Furthermore, many antivenoms are prohibitively expensive and require cold-chain storage, rendering them inaccessible or impractical in remote regions [9,10]. The unregulated proliferation of substandard or counterfeit products further erodes the trust of both clinicians and patients, jeopardizing treatment outcomes and contributing to therapeutic hesitancy [10].

Recognizing these challenges, the WHO launched its global strategy for the prevention and control of snakebite envenoming in 2019, with the goal of halving the number of deaths and disabilities by 2030 [1,6]. This plan emphasizes four pillars: community empowerment, accessibility of safe and effective antivenoms, strengthened health systems, and increased research and innovation. As part of this initiative, there is an urgent call to modernize antivenom production technologies, improve pharmacovigilance, and implement regulatory frameworks that ensure both product efficacy and equitable distribution [1,6,9].

In light of these realities, this review aims to provide a comprehensive examination of the historical development of antivenom therapy, analyze current therapeutic limitations, and explore emerging innovations that promise to revolutionize the management of snakebite envenomation. In doing so, it highlights the interplay between scientific progress and global health policy and underscores the necessity for translational research that bridges laboratory breakthroughs with real-world impact.

2. Historical Background

The genesis of antivenom therapy can be traced to the late nineteenth century, an era marked by burgeoning discoveries in immunology and the emerging germ theory of disease. Central to the early development of antivenom was the pioneering work of French physician and bacteriologist Albert Calmette. In 1891, Calmette was sent by the Institut Pasteur to establish a research facility in Saigon, then part of French Indochina, where he was confronted with high mortality rates due to cobra bites. Recognizing the urgent need for a therapeutic countermeasure, Calmette embarked on experimental immunization of horses with sublethal doses of Naja naja (Indian cobra) venom. Through repeated injections, he induced the production of circulating neutralizing antibodies in the horses, which he subsequently extracted and purified from their serum. In 1894, he reported the successful production of the first anti-cobra antivenom, which could confer passive immunity in envenomated subjects [2]. Calmette's work marked a transformative moment in toxinology, heralding the birth of serotherapy—using serum-derived antibodies to neutralize exogenous toxins—as a viable and scientific approach to treating snake envenomation.

Shortly thereafter, significant advancements were made in South America by Brazilian physician, immunologist, and biomedical scientist Vital Brazil Mineiro da Campanha. Recognizing that the venom of different snake species required targeted therapeutic strategies, Vital Brazil expanded on Calmette's work by developing polyvalent antivenoms—preparations capable of neutralizing the venoms of multiple species, especially those endemic to Brazil such as Bothrops, Crotalus, and Micrurus [3]. Unlike Calmette, who initially produced monovalent antivenoms, Vital

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0389.v2

Brazil's research highlighted the antigenic specificity of venom components and the need for regionally adapted treatments. His meticulous experiments demonstrated that snake venoms were not universally interchangeable, even among species within the same family, and that effective antivenom production required immunization with locally relevant venom mixtures. These innovations culminated in the establishment of the Instituto Butantan in São Paulo in 1901, a premier institution that has since become one of the world's leading centers for venom research, antivenom production, and public health outreach [3].

The early twentieth century witnessed further expansion of antivenom research in other parts of the world. In Australia, systematic efforts were initiated to combat the medically significant elapids, particularly Pseudonaja (brown snakes) and Oxyuranus (taipans), leading to the foundation of the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories (CSL) in 1916 [5]. Similarly, India and Africa developed region-specific immunization protocols to address the "Big Four" snakes in South Asia and medically important vipers in Africa, respectively. These global initiatives contributed to the creation of a foundational infrastructure for snakebite management, with the shared understanding that regional ecological diversity required tailored immunobiological strategies [5,9].

Throughout much of the twentieth century, antivenom therapy remained grounded in the principles established by Calmette and Vital Brazil—namely, passive immunization using animal-derived polyclonal antibodies. Horses (and occasionally sheep) were the preferred source animals due to their size, immunogenic tolerance, and capacity to generate high antibody titers [5]. The antibodies were often administered as whole IgG molecules, though subsequent innovations led to the enzymatic digestion of IgG into smaller fragments such as $F(ab')_2$ and Fab, in an effort to reduce the incidence of adverse immunologic reactions and improve pharmacokinetics [7].

Despite its life-saving potential, traditional antivenom therapy has been hindered historically by limitations in production scalability, quality control, geographic specificity, and adverse reactions associated with heterologous proteins [7,9]. These challenges laid the groundwork for twenty-first-century calls to modernize and innovate antivenom therapeutics through biotechnological and recombinant approaches [7,8].

In sum, the historical trajectory of antivenom therapy is a compelling example of translational medical science that spans over a century. The foundational contributions of Calmette and Vital Brazil not only saved countless lives but also galvanized international efforts to confront one of the most lethal yet neglected causes of injury and mortality in the Global South [2,3]. Their legacy continues to shape contemporary research, underscoring the enduring importance of venom immunology as both a clinical and scientific frontier [5,7,9].

3. Current State of Antivenom Therapy

Modern antivenom production is fundamentally grounded in immunological principles established over a century ago by Calmette and Vital Brazil [2,3], yet the process has undergone considerable refinement to improve yield, purity, and safety. The most common production method involves hyperimmunization of large, domesticated animals—most often horses (Equus ferus caballus) or sheep (Ovis aries)—through the administration of gradually escalating doses of snake venom [5]. These animals develop a robust humoral immune response, generating high titers of polyclonal immunoglobulin G (IgG) antibodies capable of neutralizing the toxic components of the venom [5].

After sufficient antibody production is confirmed via serological assays, blood is harvested from the animals and plasma is separated for downstream processing [5]. The resulting antibody preparations are subjected to fractionation and enzymatic digestion to enhance their pharmacological profiles and minimize adverse reactions [7]. Three principal antivenom formulations are commonly used: whole IgG, $F(ab')_2$ fragments produced via pepsin digestion (which removes the Fc portion while preserving bivalent antigen-binding sites), and Fab fragments derived through papain digestion (monovalent and rapidly cleared from circulation) [7]. The choice of fragment type influences both the efficacy and safety of the antivenom [7]. While Fab fragments exhibit faster tissue

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0389.v2

penetration and reduced immunogenicity, they are also associated with shorter half-lives and an increased risk of venom recurrence, or "rebound" toxicity, particularly in envenomations involving tissue-depositing toxins [12].

Despite their proven life-saving capabilities, traditional antivenoms suffer from multiple limitations that impede their effectiveness and availability in real-world clinical settings [5,7,9]. One of the most prominent challenges is venom specificity. Because antivenoms are typically raised against venoms from particular species or genera, their efficacy is restricted to envenomations by those specific snakes or closely related taxa [5,7,9]. Given that accurate snake identification is often impossible in emergency scenarios—particularly when the bite is unwitnessed or the snake escapes—there is a high risk of therapeutic mismatch [5,7,9]. This is especially problematic in regions with high biodiversity or where multiple medically significant species co-occur [5,7,9].

Another serious limitation is the immunogenicity of heterologous antibodies. Since these products are derived from non-human animals, their administration can provoke adverse immune responses ranging from mild urticaria and fever to severe anaphylaxis and delayed serum sickness [7,12]. This immunologic burden not only complicates clinical management but also deters some patients from seeking care due to fear or previous negative experiences [12]. Although premedication with antihistamines and corticosteroids is common practice, these measures are not always effective in mitigating severe reactions [12].

Furthermore, logistical and economic barriers play a substantial role in restricting access to antivenom therapy in the regions where it is most urgently needed. Antivenoms are biologic products that require strict cold-chain storage conditions (typically 2–8°C) to maintain their stability and efficacy [5,9]. Such requirements are difficult to meet in many rural or resource-poor settings, where electricity and refrigeration may be intermittent or nonexistent [9]. The production process itself is also expensive and time-consuming, involving extensive quality control measures to ensure sterility, potency, and freedom from transmissible agents [9]. These costs are often passed on to healthcare systems or patients, rendering the antivenom unaffordable in many low-income countries [5,9,10]. As a result, supply-demand mismatches and commercial disincentives have led to the withdrawal of manufacturers from unprofitable markets, exacerbating global shortages [5,9,10].

In response to these systemic challenges, the World Health Organization (WHO) has intensified its efforts to coordinate a global strategy for snakebite envenomation, which it formally designated as a neglected tropical disease (NTD) in 2017 [1,6]. A landmark initiative— "Snakebite Envenoming: A Strategy for Prevention and Control"—was published by the WHO in 2019 [1,6]. This strategy outlines ambitious goals to reduce snakebite deaths and disabilities by 50% by the year 2030 [1,6]. It emphasizes strengthening antivenom manufacturing capabilities in endemic countries, developing standardized preclinical testing protocols, and fostering international partnerships to subsidize and regulate the antivenom market [6,9]. One of the key components of this initiative is the creation of a prequalification program, akin to those used for vaccines and essential medicines, which would evaluate the safety, efficacy, and quality of antivenoms to guide procurement decisions by national health agencies [17].

In addition to WHO efforts, academic research institutions, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and public-private partnerships have begun investing in alternative therapeutic approaches, including recombinant antivenoms, monoclonal antibodies, and small-molecule inhibitors [7,8,11]. These emerging technologies hold the promise of safer, more cost-effective, and broadly neutralizing antivenoms, but their widespread clinical adoption remains several years away [7,8,11].

In conclusion, while modern antivenoms have saved countless lives and represent a significant achievement in medical science, their current formulation and distribution remain suboptimal [5,7,9]. A multifaceted approach—spanning scientific innovation, policy reform, and health systems strengthening—is required to overcome these barriers and ensure that antivenom therapy becomes a universally accessible and effective intervention [6,9,10].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0389.v2

4. Innovations in Antivenom Therapy

Innovations in antivenom therapy over the past two decades have sought to overcome the persistent limitations of traditional animal-derived antivenoms and to develop novel approaches that are safer, more effective, and accessible to snakebite victims in endemic regions [7,8,11]. While current manufacturing processes remain largely rooted in the historical principles established by Calmette and Vital Brazil [2,3], emerging biotechnological advancements are now reshaping the landscape of envenomation treatment.

One of the most promising avenues of innovation involves the development of recombinant and monoclonal antibody-based therapies. Unlike conventional polyclonal antivenoms, which contain a complex and variable mixture of antibodies harvested from immunized animals, recombinant antivenoms can be engineered to contain specific human or humanized monoclonal antibodies that target the most toxic and medically relevant components of snake venom, such as metalloproteinases, phospholipases A_2, and three-finger toxins [7,8]. These monoclonal antibodies can be produced in controlled cell culture systems, eliminating the reliance on animal immunization and addressing key issues related to batch variability, immunogenicity, and contamination [7,8]. Furthermore, because they can be precisely designed to recognize conserved toxin epitopes across different snake species, recombinant antivenoms hold the potential for broader cross-neutralization, mitigating the clinical challenge of species misidentification [7,8].

Another area of advancement lies in the use of small-molecule enzyme inhibitors that directly target venom toxins. These compounds, such as varespladib and batimastat, have been shown in preclinical models to neutralize venom activity by inhibiting enzymatic components critical to tissue damage and systemic toxicity [11]. Varespladib, in particular, is a potent inhibitor of secretory phospholipase A_2 ($sPLA_2$), a major component of many elapid and viperid venoms [11]. Its small molecular size and potential for oral or parenteral administration make it a promising candidate for field-based, first-line intervention prior to definitive antivenom administration [11]. Such adjunctive therapies may not only improve survival rates but also reduce the dose of antivenom required, thereby diminishing the risk of adverse reactions and lowering treatment costs [11,12].

Advancements in nanotechnology have also opened new possibilities for the development of antivenom alternatives. Nanoparticles such as liposomes and dendrimers are being explored as delivery vehicles for toxin-binding ligands or as scaffolds for detoxifying agents [8]. These nanoscale platforms can be tailored to enhance tissue penetration, prolong circulation time, and improve stability under ambient conditions—features that are particularly valuable in resource-limited settings where cold-chain logistics are a major barrier to effective care [8].

Synthetic epitope-based vaccines represent a preventive strategy that diverges from reactive treatment paradigms. By identifying conserved immunogenic regions across venom toxins, researchers aim to create immunogens capable of eliciting protective immune responses in humans, thereby providing immunity against envenomation [8]. While still in early experimental phases, such vaccines could revolutionize snakebite management in high-risk occupational or geographic populations, especially in areas with limited access to healthcare [8].

Despite the promise of these innovations, several obstacles remain. Regulatory pathways for novel biologics, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, can be lengthy and inconsistent [10]. There is also the need for substantial investment in clinical trials to assess the safety, efficacy, and cost-effectiveness of these emerging therapies compared to traditional antivenoms [13,14]. Moreover, stakeholder coordination—including governments, manufacturers, academic institutions, and non-governmental organizations—is critical to ensure that these technologies reach the populations most in need [10].

In response to these complex challenges, the World Health Organization (WHO) has launched a global strategy to halve the number of snakebite deaths and disabilities by 2030 [1,6]. This strategy includes a commitment to supporting research and development of next-generation antivenoms, promoting the use of standardized preclinical efficacy testing, and facilitating regulatory harmonization for new products [6,17]. Furthermore, WHO has established a global antivenom

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0389.v2

prequalification program aimed at ensuring the quality, safety, and effectiveness of antivenoms through rigorous review and quality control standards [17]. This initiative seeks not only to rebuild market confidence but also to ensure equitable access to high-quality products in affected regions [1,6,9].

In sum, while traditional antivenoms remain essential tools in snakebite management, ongoing scientific advancements are paving the way toward more rational, scalable, and patient-centered therapies. The integration of recombinant biotechnology, small-molecule pharmacology, nanomedicine, and synthetic vaccinology represents a paradigm shift that, if successfully translated into clinical practice, could dramatically improve outcomes for snakebite victims worldwide [7,8,11].

5. Ongoing Clinical Trials

Numerous clinical trials registered on ClinicalTrials.gov and other international platforms are actively investigating advanced therapeutic strategies to improve the treatment of snakebite envenomation [13]. These efforts reflect a global commitment to modernizing antivenom therapy, expanding beyond traditional polyclonal antibody-based products to encompass a broad spectrum of innovative modalities [13]. The diversity of these clinical studies highlights the growing complexity and scientific depth of the field.

One of the most notable advancements in this domain is the investigation of small molecule inhibitors such as varespladib-methyl, an oral secretory phospholipase A_2 ($sPLA_2$) inhibitor. The Phase 2 clinical trial (NCT04996264) is currently evaluating its safety, tolerability, and efficacy in envenomated patients [11,13]. This molecule has shown promise as a broad-spectrum neutralizer of venom activity in preclinical studies, offering the potential to be used as a pre-referral intervention in rural or remote settings where access to healthcare is limited and delays in treatment are common [11,13].

Another interventional study (NCT04470791), conducted in Mexico, is examining the use of localized cryotherapy as a supplementary approach to standard antivenom treatment in patients with Bothrops envenomation [13]. Cryotherapy may reduce local inflammation and tissue necrosis, which are common complications associated with viperid bites. If successful, this strategy could be incorporated into clinical practice to improve functional outcomes and reduce the need for surgical interventions such as debridement or amputation [13].

In terms of observational research, trial NCT04520282 aims to measure hemostatic parameters in patients suffering from venom-induced consumption coagulopathy (VICC), a frequent and serious manifestation of envenomation, especially by vipers [13]. By improving the understanding of coagulation profiles in affected individuals, this study may contribute to the development of more targeted and effective supportive therapies, including the timing and dosing of clotting factor replacements [13].

Diagnostics are also a focal point in contemporary clinical research. Trial NCT03859154, for instance, is developing non-invasive waveform analysis tools to detect early signs of hematotoxic envenomation [13]. Accurate and rapid diagnostics are essential in low-resource environments where laboratory infrastructure may be limited, and snake identification is often impossible. Such innovations can inform early triage and therapeutic decisions, thereby improving patient survival and outcomes [13].

Additionally, trial NCT00811239 evaluates the clinical utility and safety of specific antivenoms in treating envenoming by Bungarus multicinctus, the many-banded krait, which produces a neurotoxic venom capable of causing respiratory paralysis [13]. Randomized controlled trials like this one are essential for validating the efficacy of targeted therapies and optimizing antivenom specificity [13,14].

Collectively, these trials demonstrate a multidimensional approach to snakebite envenomation, integrating pharmacologic, procedural, diagnostic, and supportive care innovations [13,14]. They not only enrich the scientific understanding of envenomation pathophysiology but also provide essential data for shaping global guidelines, regulatory policies, and treatment algorithms [13,14]. The future

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0389.v2

of antivenom therapy depends on sustained investment in such clinical research, which will be instrumental in achieving the WHO's strategic goal of halving snakebite-related deaths and disabilities by 2030 [1,6].

6. Conclusions

Over a century after Albert Calmette's pioneering work laid the foundation for antivenom therapy [2], snakebite envenomation remains a persistently neglected yet urgent global health challenge. It disproportionately affects impoverished populations in sub-Saharan Africa, South and Southeast Asia, and parts of Latin America—regions where health infrastructure is often fragile, access to timely medical care is limited, and reliable supplies of quality-assured antivenom are inconsistent or entirely absent [1,4,5]. Despite being classified as a high-priority neglected tropical disease by the World Health Organization, snakebite envenomation continues to receive less attention, funding, and scientific engagement compared to other similarly burdensome diseases [1,5,6,18]. This disconnect has perpetuated a cycle of inadequate treatment access, delayed interventions, and high rates of morbidity and mortality, particularly among rural and agrarian communities [5,9,10].

While traditional polyclonal antibody-based antivenoms remain the cornerstone of clinical treatment, their limitations are increasingly apparent. Species-specific efficacy, risk of hypersensitivity reactions, cold chain dependence, and complex manufacturing requirements hinder their utility in precisely the areas where they are most needed [5,7,9,10]. These challenges underscore the need for innovation not only in therapeutic design but also in systems of distribution, affordability, and global policy regulation [6,10,17].

Recent scientific advancements provide a promising outlook for transforming the treatment landscape. Monoclonal antibodies offer enhanced specificity and reduced immunogenicity, while phage display and recombinant technologies allow for the precise identification and production of neutralizing components against a broad spectrum of venom toxins [7,8]. Small-molecule inhibitors such as varespladib and metalloproteinase blockers represent an entirely different pharmacological class of antivenom, one that holds promise as an orally available, broad-spectrum, and potentially pre-hospital therapy—especially critical in settings where immediate access to healthcare is not possible [11,12]. Moreover, the parallel development of novel diagnostic tools and supportive care protocols aims to improve early detection and targeted intervention, ultimately enhancing patient survival and reducing complications such as limb necrosis and coagulopathy [13].

Ongoing and emerging clinical trials serve as the necessary scientific bedrock for translating these experimental therapies into clinical practice [13,14]. These trials are crucial not only for assessing safety and efficacy but also for informing treatment guidelines, facilitating regulatory approvals, and guiding future research investments [13,14]. As the global health community continues to prioritize the elimination of preventable deaths and disabilities caused by snakebite, the importance of evidence-based, scalable, and context-appropriate interventions cannot be overstated [1,6,9].

Ultimately, to reduce the global burden of snakebite envenomation, sustained and coordinated action is required. This entails increased public and private investment in research and development, capacity-building for regional manufacturing, and international collaboration to harmonize regulatory standards and ensure equitable access to antivenom products [1,6,9,10,17]. Public health campaigns aimed at education, prevention, and community engagement must also be integrated into broader health systems strengthening initiatives. Only through a comprehensive and sustained global response can we hope to overcome the challenges posed by snakebite envenomation and honor the scientific legacy that began over a century ago with the goal of saving lives [2,3,5].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0389.v2

References

1. World Health Organization. Snakebite envenoming: a strategy for prevention and control. Geneva: WHO; 2019. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/324838
2. Calmette A. Contribution à l'étude du venin des serpents: immunisation des animaux et traitement de l'envenimation. Ann Inst Pasteur (Paris). 1894;8:275–91.
3. Vital Brazil O. Veneno de cobra: estudos experimentaes. Mem Inst Butantan. 1911;1:5-232.
4. Harrison RA, Hargreaves A, Wagstaff SC, Faragher B, Lalloo DG. Snake envenoming: a disease of poverty. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2009;3(12):e569. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0000569. PMID:20027216
5. Gutiérrez JM, Calvete JJ, Habib AG, Harrison RA, Williams DJ, Warrell DA. Snakebite envenoming. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2017;3:17063. doi:10.1038/nrdp.2017.63. PMID:28905944
6. Williams DJ, Faiz MA, Abela-Ridder B, et al. Strategy for a globally coordinated response to a priority neglected tropical disease: Snakebite envenoming. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2019;13(2):e0007059. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007059. PMID:35398504
7. Laustsen AH, Engmark M, Milbo C, et al. From fangs to pharmacology: the future of snakebite envenoming therapy. Curr Pharm Des. 2016;22(34):5270-5293. doi:10.2174/1381612822666160518121703. PMID:27196999
8. Knudsen C, Laustsen AH. Recent advances in next generation snakebite antivenoms. Trop Med Infect Dis. 2018;3(2):42. doi:10.3390/tropicalmed3020042. PMID:30274462
9. Gutiérrez JM. Global availability of antivenoms: The relevance of public manufacturing laboratories. Toxins (Basel). 2018;10(5):138. doi:10.3390/toxins10050138. PMID:29734717
10. Abouyannis M, Alagon A, Brown N, et al. Challenges and opportunities for improving the availability of antivenom to treat snakebite envenoming in ASEAN countries: A policy and regulatory perspective. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2022;16(4):e0010300. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0010300. PMID:35398504
11. Lewin M, Samuel S, Merkel J, Bickler PE. Varespladib (LY315920) appears to be a potent, broad-spectrum, inhibitor of snake venom phospholipase A2 and a possible pre-referral treatment for envenomation. Toxins (Basel). 2016;8(9):248. doi:10.3390/toxins8090248. PMID:27672319
12. Silva A, Hodgson WC, Isbister GK. Antivenom for neuromuscular paralysis resulting from snake envenoming. Toxins (Basel). 2017;9(11):338. doi:10.3390/toxins9110338. PMID:29156663
13. ClinicalTrials.gov. Search of: Snakebite OR Antivenom. Bethesda (MD): National Library of Medicine (US). Available from: https://clinicaltrials.gov
14. Mahmood S, Shanks L, Faiz MA, Rahman MR, Karim MR, Paul S, et al. Randomized controlled trial of early antivenom administration in Russell's viper envenoming in Bangladesh: 2-dose vs 1-dose regimens. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2021;15(6):e0009487. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0009487. PMID:34133445
15. Warrell DA. Guidelines for the management of snake-bites. Geneva: WHO Regional Office for South-East Asia; 2016. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/249547
16. Arias AS, Rucavado A, Gutiérrez JM. Antivenoms: Basic aspects and clinical applications. In: Gopalakrishnakone P, editor. Toxinology. Dordrecht: Springer; 2015. p.1–20. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-6288-6_1-1
17. World Health Organization. WHO guidelines for the production, control and regulation of snake antivenom immunoglobulins. Geneva: WHO; 2017. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789241510369
18. Chippaux JP. Snakebite envenomation turns again into a neglected tropical disease! J Venom Anim Toxins Incl Trop Dis. 2017;23:38. doi:10.1186/s40409-017-0127-6. PMID:29085690