A systematic review of efficacy and safety of intramuscular midazolam versus midazolam by other routes or other non-intravenous benzodiazepines in children with convulsive status epilepticus

Running heading: Efficacy and safety of intramuscular midazolam in children with acute convulsive seizures

Richard F. M. Chin[1], Michael J. Vasey[2], Frank M. C. Besag[2,3,4]

1. Child Life and Health Department, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
2. East London NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
3. King's College London, London, UK
4. University College London, London, UK

* Corresponding author:

ORCiD

Richard F. M. Chin: 0000-0002-7256-3027

Michael J. Vasey: 0000-0003-1983-3531

Frank M. C. Besag: 0000-0002-4530-7933

Declarations

I. Funding: No funding was received in connection with the preparation of this manuscript.

II. Conflicts of interest: The authors state that they have no conflicts of interest.

III. Availability of data and material: Not applicable.

IV. Ethics approval: Not applicable.

V. Consent to participate: Not applicable.

VI. Consent for publication: Not applicable.

VII. Code availability: Not applicable.

VIII. Author contributions: Literature search, systematic review and data analysis conducted by RC and MV. All authors contributed to the preparation of the manuscript and approved the final version for submission.

Abstract

Background: Convulsive status epilepticus (CSE) is the most common neurological emergency in children. Without prompt, safe and effective intervention, CSE can cause adverse neurological sequelae or death. There is increasing use of intramuscular midazolam for the treatment of childhood CSE.

The aim of this systematic review is to investigate the efficacy and safety of intramuscular midazolam versus midazolam by other routes or other non-intravenous benzodiazepines in childhood CSE.

Methods: MEDLINE, PubMed, Embase, Cochrane CENTRAL and Google Scholar were searched from 01/01/1980 to 29/08/2025. The primary outcome of interest was cessation of seizures within 5-10 minutes of treatment. Secondary outcomes included time to seizure cessation and incidence of respiratory depression/hypotension.

Results: Five studies were identified comparing intramuscular midazolam with buccal midazolam, intranasal midazolam or rectal diazepam. In single studies, there was no difference between intramuscular midazolam and intranasal midazolam or rectal diazepam in achieving seizure cessation, but intramuscular midazolam was associated with shorter time to seizure cessation. Meta-analysis was only possible comparing intramuscular midazolam with buccal midazolam. Intramuscular midazolam was superior to buccal midazolam for time to seizure cessation ($p<0.00001$). While there were no inter-group differences in other outcomes, point estimates favoured intramuscular midazolam. Few cases of respiratory depression or hypotension were reported with no inter-group differences. No studies involved treatment by paramedics, sample sizes were modest, and none were in Western high-income countries. Quality of evidence was low or very low.

Discussion: There is insufficient clinical trial evidence for safety and efficacy of intramuscular midazolam compared to midazolam by other routes or other non-intravenous benzodiazepines for childhood CSE.

Key points

- Out-of-hospital treatment is usually needed to achieve prompt seizure cessation in convulsive status epilepticus.
- Limited data indicate that intramuscular midazolam achieves faster seizure cessation than buccal midazolam.

1. Introduction

Convulsive status epilepticus (CSE) is operationally defined for treatment purposes as a tonic, clonic, or tonic-clonic seizure of at least five minutes duration or two or more such seizures in succession without recovery of consciousness between seizures [1, 2]. Seizures that have not spontaneously resolved or been successfully aborted within five minutes are more likely to continue for at least 30 minutes, after which there is a substantial risk of serious long-term neurological and neurodevelopmental sequelae, including neuronal injury, neuronal death, alteration of neuronal networks and functional deficits [2], and death. However, the time to initiation of emergency antiseizure medication (ASM) after onset of CSE is often greater than 30 minutes, especially where treatment is not commenced until admission to the hospital emergency department [3, 4]. Prognosis worsens with longer duration of continuous seizure activity, particularly where this exceeds 1-2 hours [5].

CSE is one of the most common medical neurological emergencies in children, estimated at between 17 and 23 episodes per 100 000 individuals per year in developed countries, and often occurs in children with no prior history of seizures or epilepsy [1, 6, 7]. Incidence is higher than in adults [8], highest in children under the age of five years [9], and decreases with increasing age [1]. Although mortality rates are lower than in adults [10], long-term impairments and increased mortality after childhood CSE are common [11]. The cumulative incidence of subsequent epilepsy at nine-years post-CSE is around 25% and neurological, cognitive and behavioural impairments are reported in at least one third of individuals. Long-term mortality rates are between 5% and 17% [12].

Since seizures in this population are more likely to occur either at home or in the community, and transfer to hospital may introduce avoidable delays in the initiation of treatment, there is considerable interest in optimising out-of-hospital interventions that can be administered quickly and effectively by both non-medical personnel and paramedics.

Benzodiazepines are the standard first-line emergency treatment for CSE [9, 13]. However, ongoing seizures become progressively less responsive to these drugs, possibly due to cellular internalisation ("receptor trafficking") of the target inhibitory gamma-aminobutyric acid $(GABA)_A$ receptors as an effect of continuous seizure activity [14, 15]. Rapid, effective and safe intervention for CSE is therefore essential to mitigate the risk of adverse short-term and longer-term outcomes [14].

The current guidelines of the UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) recommend either buccal midazolam (unlicensed for adults) or rectal diazepam for community intervention where intravenous access is unlikely to be possible, or intravenous lorazepam where intravenous access and resuscitation facilities are immediately available [16].

Midazolam is a rapidly absorbed, short-acting, water-soluble benzodiazepine [17, 18] which, as an alternative to the buccal route, can be administered intranasally, intramuscularly or intravenously. Buccal midazolam and intranasal midazolam have shown efficacy for cessation of childhood CSE at least comparable to that of rectal diazepam, are considered easier to administer than rectal diazepam and are more socially acceptable [19-27]. There are fewer data for intramuscular midazolam in out-of-hospital paediatric use; however, a report by the Guideline Committee of the American Epilepsy Society concluded that there was Level A evidence to support the use of intramuscular midazolam in adult CSE and Level B evidence for its use in paediatric CSE [28]. The most recent Joint Royal Colleges Ambulance Liaison Committee (JRCALC) guidelines specify that intramuscular midazolam or buccal midazolam are preferred first-line paramedic treatment given their superiority to rectal diazepam.

The objective of this systematic review is to examine the existing data for the efficacy and safety of intramuscular midazolam compared with midazolam administered by any other route and other non-intravenous benzodiazepines in the treatment of CSE in children either out of hospital or in-hospital, including in the accident and emergency department.

2. Methods

2.1 Search and eligibility criteria

The review was conducted in accordance with the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines (prisma-statement.org). The review protocol was registered with PROSPERO (CRD420251129713).

A systematic literature search was conducted in MEDLINE, PubMed, Embase, Cochrane CENTRAL and Google Scholar for human, non-placebo controlled, comparative clinical trials published between 01/01/1980 and 29/08/2025. The detailed search strategy is available in the supplementary material. The reference lists of relevant reviews and articles were manually screened to identify additional studies. Randomised and quasi-randomised controlled trials, irrespective of blinding, were included. Studies were eligible if they reported data for children aged 0-18 years who had an acute convulsive seizure, treated with one or more ASM either in or out of hospital, irrespective of the cause or duration of the seizure, or whether the child had a known existing seizure disorder or the seizure was the first in their lifetime; and compared seizure outcomes between children treated with intramuscular midazolam and children treated with midazolam administered by another, non-intravenous, route or another non-intravenous benzodiazepine. There were no language or other restrictions.

The primary outcome of interest was cessation of the seizure within 10 minutes of commencement of drug administration. Secondary outcomes included time to clinical seizure cessation from the time of drug administration; recurrence of seizures within one hour of initial seizure cessation; and incidence of respiratory depression or hypotension.

Search results were imported to Covidence (covidence.org) and duplicate articles identified and excluded. The titles and abstracts of the remaining articles were independently screened by two of the authors (RC and MV). The full texts of potentially relevant studies were assessed against the eligibility criteria and disagreements resolved by consensus.

Data from studies meeting the eligibility criteria, including study design, participants, methodology, inclusion and exclusion criteria, outcomes, results and source of funding or other support, were independently extracted using a bespoke data form created in Covidence and discrepancies identified and resolved by consensus. Missing data were sought from the authors of the original studies. Data were exported to RevMan Web (revman.cochrane.org) for analysis.

Risk of bias in the included studies was assessed using the Cochrane Collaboration Risk of Bias Tool Version 2 (RoB2) and overall study quality assessed using the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach (gradepro.org).

2.2 Data synthesis

Primary data analysis was performed on the basis of intention-to-treat. Heterogeneity between studies was assessed using the restricted maximum-likelihood (REML) method and visual inspection of forest plots. If substantial heterogeneity was detected ($I^2 > 50\%$) a random effects model was employed; otherwise the data were analysed using a fixed effects model.

Relative risk (RR) estimates for dichotomous outcomes and weighted mean differences (MD) for continuous outcomes were calculated with corresponding 95% confidence intervals.

Statistical significance was determined based on an alpha level of 0.05.

3. Results

3.1 Study selection

A total of 298 articles were returned by the primary literature search. One further article was identified via screening of the reference lists of previous reviews. Removal of duplicates resulted in 243 unique articles. Of these, 220 articles were excluded following screening of titles and abstracts. The full texts of the remaining 23 articles were reviewed, resulting in five eligible studies being identified (Figure 1).

3.2 Study characteristics

Of the five studies [29-33], three [29, 30, 32] compared intramuscular midazolam with buccal midazolam (Table 1). One of these studies also included an intranasal midazolam treatment arm [30]. The remaining studies [31, 33] compared intramuscular midazolam with rectal diazepam. All studies included children treated in the hospital emergency department by hospital medics. The study in which intramuscular midazolam was compared with both buccal and intranasal midazolam also recruited a home group in which the emergency ASM was administered by the children's parents. There were no studies in which data for emergency ASM administration by paramedics were reported.

Four studies were randomised [29-31, 33], one of which used a double-blind, double-dummy design to compare intramuscular midazolam with buccal midazolam [29]. The remaining study was a non-randomised, open-label study [32]. In total, 640 participants were enrolled of whom 444 received treatment in the emergency department and 196 received treatment at home. Data were reported for 613 participants, 428 treated in the emergency department and 185 treated at home. Of the 428 treated in the emergency department, 196 received intramuscular midazolam, 34 intranasal midazolam, 115 buccal midazolam and 83 rectal diazepam. In the single study reporting data for children treated at home [30], some participants in the at-home group provided data for more than one seizure episode, resulting in data being reported for a total of 196 seizures in 185 individuals of which 69 seizures were treated with intramuscular midazolam, 60 with intranasal midazolam and 67 with buccal midazolam. Per-protocol midazolam doses, irrespective of route of administration, were between 0.2 mg/kg and 0.3 mg/kg. Intramuscular midazolam was administered at a dose of 0.3 mg/kg in three of the four studies [29, 31, 32] and 0.2 mg/kg in the remaining study [30]. The maximum per-protocol dose of intramuscular midazolam was 8 mg in one study [29], 10 mg in one study [30] and was not stated in the remaining studies [31-33]. Rectal diazepam was administered at a dose of 0.5 mg/kg [31, 33] (Table 1).

All studies described treatment for acute seizures but seizure eligibility criteria varied between studies: four studies included individuals with single convulsive seizures lasting ≥ 5 minutes [29-32]; two studies additionally included individuals with ≥ 3 convulsive seizures within the preceding hour [30, 32]; and one study additionally included individuals with ≥ 2 convulsive seizures in succession without recovery of consciousness [30]. The remaining study included individuals with any acute seizure but excluded individuals presenting with status epilepticus [33].The studies were conducted in Qatar, Egypt, Iran, Kenya and Pakistan.

3.3 Efficacy outcomes

The main efficacy outcomes for each of the included studies are summarised in Table 2.

3.3.1 Seizure cessation within 5-10 minutes of drug administration

In individual studies, seizure cessation within 10 minutes of drug administration was similar for intramuscular, buccal and intranasal midazolam [29, 30], and for intramuscular midazolam compared with rectal diazepam [31]. Point estimates tended to favour intramuscular midazolam. In the study by Alansari et al. [29], seizure cessation within 10 minutes was reported in 72% in the intramuscular midazolam group compared with 63% in the buccal midazolam group. It should be noted that seizures that had not responded to initial benzodiazepine treatment within 5 minutes in this study were treated with additional ASMs. Seizure cessation at 5 minutes following initial benzodiazepine administration also favoured intramuscular midazolam (61%) over buccal midazolam (46%; $p = 0.07$). In the study by Mohammed et al. [30], caregivers reported seizure cessation within 10 minutes in a higher percentage of those treated at home relative to those treated in hospital. 94.2% of children treated at home with intramuscular midazolam had seizure cessation compared with 93.3% treated with intranasal midazolam and 91.0% treated with buccal midazolam. In the emergency department groups in the same study, the corresponding proportions were 85.3%, 88.2% and 78.4%. Muchohi et al. [32] reported seizure cessation within 10 minutes in 50% treated with intramuscular midazolam and 40% treated with buccal midazolam. Finally, in the study by Momen et al. [31], 96% of individuals treated with intramuscular midazolam had cessation of seizures within 10 minutes compared with 94% treated with rectal diazepam.

Meta-analysis was possible only for the comparison of intramuscular midazolam with buccal midazolam. There was no difference between treatment groups in the analysis including data for both the emergency

department and home settings (RR = 1.07; 95% CI = 0.97-1.17; Z = 1.40; p = 0.16) (Figure 2A) or analysis of data for the emergency department only (RR = 1.17; 95% CI = 0.97-1.40; Z = 1.69; p = 0.09) (Figure 3A). However, point estimates favoured intramuscular midazolam. Since the protocol for the Alansari et al. study stipulated additional ASM treatment for seizures that had not been controlled within 5 minutes of initial benzodiazepine administration, the 5-minute data for this study were used in the meta-analysis for this outcome. For the other studies included in the analysis, data were for seizure cessation within 10 minutes.

3.3.2 Time to seizure cessation after drug administration

In individual studies, time to seizure cessation after drug administration was shorter with intramuscular midazolam than with intranasal midazolam or buccal midazolam in both home and emergency department treatment groups in one study (both $p < 0.0001$) [30], but there was no difference between intramuscular and buccal midazolam in another study ($p = 0.69$), although point estimates favoured intramuscular midazolam (15.9 ± 28.7 vs 17.8 ± 27.5 mins) [29]. The median time to seizure cessation in the study in children with seizures associated with malaria was longer for intramuscular midazolam (5 mins) than for buccal midazolam (3.5 mins) [32]. In the studies comparing intramuscular midazolam to rectal diazepam, time to seizure cessation was shorter in the intramuscular midazolam group ($p < 0.001$) [31, 33].

In the meta-analysis, intramuscular midazolam was superior to buccal midazolam in analysis, including data for both emergency department and home groups (MD = -2.28; 95% CI: -2.63 to -1.92; Z = 12.47; $p < 0.0001$) (Figure 2B) and data for the emergency department only (MD = -2.44; 95% CI: -2.99 to -1.89; Z = 8.65; $p < 0.0001$) (Figure 3B).

3.3.3 Recurrence of seizures within 1 hour of initial seizure cessation

In individual studies, there was no difference in seizure recurrence within one hour between intramuscular midazolam, intranasal midazolam or buccal midazolam [29, 30], or between intramuscular midazolam and rectal diazepam [31]. Point estimates typically, but not always, favoured intramuscular midazolam: 12% vs 14% for buccal midazolam in the study by Alansari et al. [29]; 2.9%, 7.5% and 5.0% for intramuscular, buccal and intranasal routes, respectively, in the home groups, and 5.9%, 10.8% and 2.9% for intramuscular, buccal and intranasal routes, respectively, in the emergency room groups in the study by Mohammed et al. [30]. In the study comparing intramuscular midazolam with rectal diazepam, there was no recurrence of seizures within one hour in any of the individuals who had cessation of the index seizure within 10 minutes of drug administration in either treatment group [31].

In the meta-analysis, there was no difference between intramuscular midazolam and buccal midazolam either in the analysis including data for both emergency department and home settings (RR = 0.67; 95% CI = 0.34-1.34; Z = 1.13; p = 0.26) (Figure 2C) or the analysis of data for the emergency department only (RR = 0.76; 95% CI = 0.35-1.64; Z = 0.70; p = 0.48) (Figure 3C).

3.4 Incidence of respiratory depression and hypotension

Very few cases of respiratory depression or hypotension were reported in any of the studies. In one study, a single child developed respiratory depression and hypotension three minutes after administration of intramuscular midazolam and was successfully treated with oral airway, bag valve mask ventilation and 20 mL/kg bolus of normal saline [29]. In another study, respiratory depression was reported in a child mistakenly administered double the intended dose of intramuscular midazolam (0.6 mg/kg) who recovered following bag valve mask ventilation [31]. Cases of respiratory depression were also reported in children with seizures associated with severe malaria treated with either intramuscular midazolam (n = 1) or buccal midazolam (n = 2) all of which were successfully treated with the benzodiazepine antagonist flumazenil [32]. The study excluded children who had compromised cardio-respiratory function at the time of admission to the paediatric high dependency unit (but not those in respiratory distress) but did not exclude children who were admitted having already entered coma. However, no information was provided on respiration or level of consciousness before midazolam administration in the children who were recruited and provided outcome data.

This study was the only study in which deaths were reported (one in the intramuscular midazolam group and three in the buccal midazolam group), all of which occurred at least 24 hours after midazolam administration and were attributed to complications associated with malaria [32].

3.5 Risk of bias

Only two of the five studies [29, 33] were considered to have a low overall risk of bias (Figure 4). The other three studies [30-32] were considered to have a high risk of bias overall and specifically in relation to randomisation (one study was not randomised), concealment of treatment allocation and blinding of outcome assessors.

3.6 Grade of evidence

For the primary outcome, seizure cessation within 5-10 minutes of medication administration, the quality of evidence was "low" supporting the finding of no difference in effectiveness between intramuscular midazolam and buccal midazolam, and "very low" for no difference in effectiveness between intramuscular midazolam and intranasal midazolam (supplementary material). Seizure cessation within 5-10 minutes was not reported in either of the studies comparing intramuscular midazolam with rectal diazepam.

4. Discussion

Data from the five studies identified in this review suggest that intramuscular midazolam has similar safety and efficacy to intranasal midazolam, buccal midazolam or rectal diazepam for the treatment of acute paediatric seizures in direct comparisons. The quality of evidence was rated as low or very low. These findings are consistent with those reported in prospective and retrospective cohort studies which have shown at least equivalent effectiveness for intramuscular midazolam compared with intranasal midazolam and rectal diazepam [34-38]. However, as evidenced by the findings of the current review, paediatric data from randomised studies comparing intramuscular midazolam and other non-intravenous benzodiazepines are scarce.

Previous systematic reviews have tended to include data for intravenous administration of lorazepam and diazepam implying that the conclusions may be less relevant to out-of-hospital and pre-hospital settings. Since meta-analyses have often relied on grouping of data for midazolam irrespective of route of administration, the relative safety and efficacy of intramuscular midazolam compared with midazolam by other routes and other non-intravenous benzodiazepines remains to be ascertained.

The broader analyses have, however, consistently found that midazolam by any non-intravenous route has at least comparable safety and efficacy in terms of successful seizure cessation and total time to seizure cessation (including time take for drug administration) to intravenous or non-intravenous diazepam and to intravenous lorazepam [39-41]. In addition, network meta-analyses have suggested that intramuscular midazolam compares favourably to other non-intravenous benzodiazepines.

For example, the results of a recent network meta-analysis [39] of data for seizure outcomes in children treated either in the hospital emergency department or by paramedics found intramuscular midazolam was associated with the highest mean absolute risk and best rank probability (indicating the highest probability of being the most effective treatment) for number of successful seizure cessations. Intranasal midazolam had the lowest mean and best rank probability for total time to seizure cessation and buccal midazolam the lowest mean for rate of seizure recurrence.

In an earlier network meta-analysis of predominantly paediatric data from open-label randomised trials conducted in hospital emergency departments [42] intramuscular midazolam was superior to other non-intravenous medications for time to seizure cessation after administration, time to seizure cessation after arrival at hospital and time to initiate treatment.

A contemporary meta-analysis [41] of adult and paediatric data concluded that there was "no clinically important difference" between intravenous ASMs and ASMs administered by non-intravenous routes for time to seizure cessation taking into account time required for drug preparation and administration. Only one of the

233 included studies (Momen et al. [31], also included in the current review) compared intramuscular midazolam
234 with another non-intravenous benzodiazepine (rectal diazepam). The quality of evidence for all direct
235 comparisons of non-intravenous interventions was 'low' or 'very low'.

236 A 2018 Cochrane review [40] of data for in-hospital ASM treatment of paediatric tonic-clonic seizures,
237 including CSE, reported a similar rate of successful seizure cessation for intramuscular midazolam compared
238 with intravenous diazepam based on data from two studies. As in the earlier meta-analysis by Jain et al., the
239 study by Momen et al. was the only study to compare intramuscular midazolam with an alternative non-
240 intravenous benzodiazepine. Buccal midazolam was compared with rectal diazepam in four studies and
241 intranasal midazolam with rectal diazepam in a single study. Overall, rates of successful seizure cessation were
242 similar between ASMs administered via the intranasal, buccal and intramuscular routes (including intranasal
243 lorazepam and intramuscular administration of the non-benzodiazepine paraldehyde) compared with the
244 intravenous route. Reflecting the limited data, buccal midazolam was considered to have limited low or very-
245 low quality evidence to support its use as first-line treatment in the absence of intravenous access. Limited and
246 low-quality evidence suggested intranasal midazolam or intranasal lorazepam may be effective alternative
247 non-intravenous options.

248 These findings are in agreement with analyses of data from studies directly comparing midazolam with
249 diazepam [20, 24] which have concluded that non-intravenous midazolam has similar or greater effectiveness
250 for seizure outcomes and a shorter time to administration than rectal diazepam or intravenous diazepam with
251 a similar risk of adverse effects. Similarly, a network meta-analysis of data for paediatric CSE [43] found non-
252 intravenous midazolam to be more effective in achieving seizure cessation than non-intravenous diazepam.
253 Midazolam by any route of administration had the highest probability (surface under the cumulative ranking
254 area/SUCRA) of achieving seizure cessation in comparisons with diazepam and lorazepam by any route.

255 We did not consider intravenous administration in the current review because of the recognised difficulty in
256 gaining intravenous access in a child with active convulsive seizures and the consequent preference for non-
257 intravenous routes of administration for initial intervention, especially in the context of out-of-hospital or
258 prehospital treatment [9, 44, 45]. While the intravenous route is typically associated with shorter time to
259 seizure cessation once the drug has been administered [39-41, 46], the delay in establishing intravenous access
260 often means the total time to seizure cessation is shorter with non-intravenous (intramuscular, intranasal or
261 buccal) routes [20, 24, 39].

262 While rectal diazepam is rapidly absorbed, there can be considerable variation as a result of first-pass
263 metabolism and may also be impeded by other factors [47-50] resulting in low or delayed peak plasma
264 concentrations.

265 In the network meta-analysis by Arya et al. [42], rectal diazepam resulted in seizure cessation within 10
266 minutes in 70% of individuals, and sustained seizure cessation without recurrence for at least one hour in 55%,
267 being less effective on both measures than either intranasal midazolam (90% and 79%, respectively) or buccal
268 midazolam (81% and 73%, respectively) in pairwise meta-analysis. The analysis further indicated that rectal
269 diazepam was inferior to intramuscular midazolam and intranasal diazepam for time to seizure cessation, and
270 to intramuscular, intranasal and buccal midazolam for time to initiate treatment.

271 In addition to these considerations, rectal administration tends to be the least preferred option with patients,
272 caregivers and emergency services personnel because of the associated stigma and concerns over its social
273 acceptability [19, 44, 51].

274 In contrast to rectal diazepam, intramuscular, intranasal and buccal routes bypass gastric and hepatic first-pass
275 metabolism which should increase the rate of absorption resulting in a shorter time to peak plasma
276 concentration. Bioavailability is higher and more consistent with intramuscular and intranasal midazolam than
277 with rectal diazepam [24, 48] but may be reduced with buccal administration if a portion of the administered
278 dose is swallowed and metabolised [44, 52]. Partial loss of the administered dose can also occur with
279 intranasal administration either via run out through the nostrils or down the back of the oesophagus [44, 52].

Given the imperative to abort the seizure as rapidly as possible, time from drug administration to seizure cessation is the primary metric of effectiveness where all other considerations are equal; however, it is also evident that time taken for administration and ease of administration vary markedly between administration routes and are particularly important considerations where drugs are administered in out-of-hospital settings and by non-medical personnel.

In the study by Mohammed et al. [30] comparing intramuscular, intranasal and buccal midazolam, caregivers expressed greatest satisfaction with the intranasal route whereas hospital clinicians favoured the intramuscular route. Among caregivers, 30% considered intramuscular administration to be "very easy" or "easy" compared with 87% for intranasal and 90% for buccal administration. The corresponding figures for the clinician group were 97%, 91% and 97%, respectively, for intramuscular, intranasal and buccal routes. In both groups, the mean time to seizure cessation was shortest with intramuscular midazolam, suggesting the perceived relative difficulty with intramuscular administration in the caregiver group was not an impediment to successful treatment.

In 2022, a single-dose, prefilled autoinjector form of midazolam was licensed in the United States for the treatment of status epilepticus in adults [44, 53]. The use of intramuscular midazolam for paediatric seizures in prehospital settings is now an established recommendation in treatment protocols in the United States [54, 55]. In the UK, the NICE guidelines recommend buccal midazolam or rectal diazepam as first-line treatment for CSE in the community [16]. An injectable form of midazolam which can be administered either intravenously or intramuscularly is licensed for sedation and anaesthesia, but not for status epilepticus [56]. Currently there is lack of clinical trial evidence for intramuscular midazolam for out of hospital or prehospital treatment of paediatric CSE and further studies are needed to establish relative safety and efficacy compared with the established interventions as well as with intranasal forms of midazolam and diazepam.

5. Limitations

The findings of the current review should be interpreted cautiously given the various limitations of the data and the low quality of evidence. The small number of studies and paucity of data for most comparisons limited the feasibility of a comprehensive data synthesis. Only a single study provided data for the comparison of intramuscular midazolam with intranasal midazolam. No studies were identified comparing intramuscular midazolam with intranasal diazepam. Meta-analysis was only possible for the comparison of intramuscular midazolam with buccal midazolam. Inconsistencies in methodology, sample characteristics, reporting and outcomes mean the results may not be generalisable to the broader population of children presenting with CSE. Weight-based doses of intramuscular midazolam were higher in three out of the five studies (0.3 mg/kg) than the typically recommended dose for children (0.2 mg/kg). While it is unclear whether this might have affected seizure outcomes, there were very few reported cases of respiratory depression or hypotension suggesting that the higher doses were relatively well tolerated. Only one study included a treatment group in which initial rescue medication for seizures was administered outside of the hospital emergency department. We were unable to find any studies comparing intramuscular midazolam to other non-intravenous benzodiazepines in the prehospital ambulance setting. Since CSE frequently occurs in previously neurologically typical children implying that prehospital treatment in many cases will be administered by paramedics, this represents an important shortcoming in the available data. Few data were available on the duration of seizures at the time of admission to hospital in those who received initial intervention in the emergency department meaning the time taken to initiate treatment is unclear in most cases. Since none of the studies included long-term follow-ups, it was not possible to investigate the relationship between time to intervention and the risk of long-term adverse outcomes.

6. Conclusions

The evidence from randomised clinical trials is insufficient to draw firm conclusions with regard to the effectiveness of intramuscular midazolam relative to that of other non-intravenous benzodiazepines for the treatment of acute paediatric seizures. Limited data from individual randomised comparisons suggest intramuscular midazolam may have comparable safety and efficacy to midazolam administered by intranasal or buccal routes, and to rectally administered diazepam, but the quality of evidence is low or very low. There

329 are very few data for out-of-hospital administration of intramuscular midazolam compared to other non-
330 intravenous benzodiazepines for paediatric seizures and no data from randomised studies for out-of-hospital
331 or prehospital treatment by emergency service personnel. Further studies, in particular for out-of-hospital and
332 prehospital settings, are warranted. Consistent inclusion criteria, definition of eligible seizure episodes,
333 outcome measures and method of ascertainment should be used to facilitate future data syntheses.

334

Figure 1. Prisma diagram



Figure 2. Efficacy outcomes for intramuscular midazolam vs buccal midazolam (data for emergency room and home groups)

2A. Cessation of seizures within 5-10 minutes of medication administration

Study or Subgroup	Intramuscular midazolam Events	Total	Buccal midazolam Events	Total	Weight	Risk ratio IV, Random, 95% CI
Alansari 2020	41	67	32	70	7.8%	1.34 [0.97 , 1.84]
Mohammed 2024[a]	29	34	29	37	16.3%	1.09 [0.87 , 1.36]
Mohammed 2024[b]	65	69	61	67	75.2%	1.03 [0.94 , 1.14]
Muchohi 2008	6	12	3	8	0.7%	1.33 [0.46 , 3.84]
Total (Wald[c])		**182**		**182**	**100.0%**	**1.07 [0.97 , 1.17]**
Total events:	141		125			

Test for overall effect: Z = 1.40 (P = 0.16)



Heterogeneity: Tau² (REML[d]) = 0.00; Chi² = 2.54, df = 3 (P = 0.47); I² = 3%

Footnotes
[a]Emergency room
[b]Home
[c]CI calculated by Wald-type method.
[d]Tau² calculated by Restricted Maximum-Likelihood method.

2B. Time to seizure cessation from time of medication administration

Study or Subgroup	Intramuscular midazolam Mean	SD	Total	Buccal midazolam Mean	SD	Total	Weight	Mean difference IV, Random, 95% CI
Alansari 2020	15.9	28.7	67	17.8	27.5	70	0.1%	-1.90 [-11.32 , 7.52]
Mohammed 2024[a]	2.95	1.55	69	5.11	1.23	67	58.1%	-2.16 [-2.63 , -1.69]
Mohammed 2024[b]	3.47	1.13	34	5.91	1.25	37	41.8%	-2.44 [-2.99 , -1.89]
Total (Wald[c])			**170**			**174**	**100.0%**	**-2.28 [-2.63 , -1.92]**
95% prediction interval								[-2.63 , -1.92]

Test for overall effect: Z = 12.47 (P < 0.00001)



Heterogeneity: Tau² (REML[d], 95% CI) = 0.00 [0.00 , 0.82]; Chi² = 0.58, df = 2 (P = 0.75); I² = 0%

Footnotes
[a]Home
[b]Emergency room
[c]CI calculated by Wald-type method.
[d]Tau² calculated by Restricted Maximum-Likelihood method.

2C. Seizure recurrence within 1 hour of initial seizure cessation

Study or Subgroup	Intramuscular midazolam Events	Total	Buccal midazolam Events	Total	Weight	Risk ratio IV, Random, 95% CI
Alansari 2020	8	67	10	70	63.5%	0.84 [0.35 , 1.99]
Mohammed 2024[a]	2	69	5	67	18.5%	0.39 [0.08 , 1.93]
Mohammed 2024[b]	2	34	4	37	17.9%	0.54 [0.11 , 2.78]
Total (Wald[c])		**170**		**174**	**100.0%**	**0.67 [0.34 , 1.34]**
95% prediction interval						[0.34 , 1.34]
Total events:	12		19			

Test for overall effect: Z = 1.13 (P = 0.26)



Heterogeneity: Tau² (REML[d], 95% CI) = 0.00 [0.00 , 5.41]; Chi² = 0.76, df = 2 (P = 0.69); I² = 0%

Footnotes
[a]Home
[b]Emergency room
[c]CI calculated by Wald-type method.
[d]Tau² calculated by Restricted Maximum-Likelihood method.

Figure 3. Efficacy outcomes for intramuscular midazolam vs buccal midazolam (data for emergency department only)

3A. Cessation of seizures within 5-10 minutes of medication administration

Study or Subgroup	Intramuscular midazolam Events	Total	Buccal midazolam Events	Total	Weight	Risk ratio IV, Random, 95% CI
Alansari 2020	41	67	32	70	31.8%	1.34 [0.97 , 1.84]
Mohammed 2024	29	34	29	37	65.3%	1.09 [0.87 , 1.36]
Muchohi 2008	6	12	3	8	2.9%	1.33 [0.46 , 3.84]
Total (Wald[a])		**113**		**115**	**100.0%**	**1.17 [0.97 , 1.40]**
Total events:	76		64			

Test for overall effect: Z = 1.69 (P = 0.09)



Heterogeneity: Tau² (REML[b]) = 0.00; Chi² = 1.16, df = 2 (P = 0.56); I² = 2%

Footnotes

[a]CI calculated by Wald-type method.

[b]Tau² calculated by Restricted Maximum-Likelihood method.

3B. Time to seizure cessation from time of medication administration

Study or Subgroup	Intramuscular midazolam Mean	SD	Total	Buccal midazolam Mean	SD	Total	Weight	Mean difference IV, Random, 95% CI
Alansari 2020	15.9	28.7	67	17.8	27.5	70	0.3%	-1.90 [-11.32 , 7.52]
Mohammed 2024	3.47	1.13	34	5.91	1.25	37	99.7%	-2.44 [-2.99 , -1.89]
Total (Wald[a])			**101**			**107**	**100.0%**	**-2.44 [-2.99 , -1.89]**
95% prediction interval								[-2.99 , -1.89]

Test for overall effect: Z = 8.65 (P < 0.00001)



Heterogeneity: Tau² (REML[b], 95% CI) = 0.00 [0.00 , >100]; Chi² = 0.01, df = 1 (P = 0.91); I² = 0%

Footnotes

[a]CI calculated by Wald-type method.

[b]Tau² calculated by Restricted Maximum-Likelihood method.

3C. Seizure recurrence within 1 hour of initial seizure cessation

Study or Subgroup	Intramuscular midazolam Events	Total	Buccal midazolam Events	Total	Weight	Risk ratio IV, Random, 95% CI
Alansari 2020	8	67	10	70	78.0%	0.84 [0.35 , 1.99]
Mohammed 2024	2	34	4	37	22.0%	0.54 [0.11 , 2.78]
Total (Wald[a])		**101**		**107**	**100.0%**	**0.76 [0.35 , 1.64]**
95% prediction interval						[0.35 , 1.64]
Total events:	10		14			

Test for overall effect: Z = 0.70 (P = 0.48)



Heterogeneity: Tau² (REML[b], 95% CI) = 0.00 [0.00 , 93.36]; Chi² = 0.21, df = 1 (P = 0.65); I² = 0%

Footnotes

[a]CI calculated by Wald-type method.

[b]Tau² calculated by Restricted Maximum-Likelihood method.

Figure 4. Risk of bias

4A. Risk of bias graph



4B. Risk of bias summary



Table 1. Characteristics of included studies

Study	Country	Design	Setting	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Outcome measures	IM midazolam group	Comparator group(s)
Alansari (2020) NCT02897856 [29]	Qatar	Double-blind, double-dummy, randomised trial	General hospital paediatric emergency centre	Age 6 mths to 14 years; Active convulsive seizure (abnormal motor activity with associated loss of consciousness on presentation) lasting > 5 minutes; No intravenous ASM access. Status epilepticus defined as continuous or interrupted abnormal motor activity with loss of consciousness and no cessation of seizure activity for ≥ 30 minutes	Cardiac arrest or hemodynamic instability at presentation; Seizure associated with head trauma or drowning; confirmed diagnosis of bacterial meningitis or viral/bacterial encephalitis; Significant hypoglycaemia or electrolyte abnormality; History of congenital heart disease, inborn error of metabolism or allergy to benzodiazepines	Seizure cessation (physician-confirmed cessation of abnormal motor activity with at least partial recovery of consciousness) within 5 minutes of study drug administration (primary); Need for additional ASM treatment; Duration of seizure activity; seizure cessation within 10 minutes of study drug administration; Continuation of active seizure for ≥ 30 minutes after arrival at emergency dept; Recurrence of seizure activity within 1 hour; Length of hospital stay; PICU admission; Adverse effects	N (randomised) = 75 N (analysed) = 67 Dose 0.05 mL/kg (max 1.6 mL)/0.3 mg/kg (max 8 mg)	Buccal midazolam N (randomised) = 75 N (analysed) = 70 Dose 0.06 mL/kg (max 2 mL)/0.25 mg/kg (max 10 mg)
Mohammed (2024) NCT05670509 [30]	Egypt	Unblinded, randomised controlled trial	Hospital emergency dept.; Patients' home	Age 1 mth to 17 years; Known seizure disorder; Active convulsive seizure and ≥ 3 convulsions within preceding hour OR active convulsive seizure and ≥ 2 convulsions in succession without recovery of consciousness OR active single convulsive seizure lasting ≥ 5 minutes	Non-convulsive status epilepticus; Benzodiazepine treatment within 1 hour of presentation; Known history of hypersensitivity, non-responsiveness or other contraindication to benzodiazepines; Use of concomitant drugs contraindicated in combination with benzodiazepines; Significant hypotension, cardiac dysrhythmia or current hypoglycaemia on presentation to hospital;	Cessation (caregiver/physician-confirmed absence of abnormal motor activity with partial or full recovery of consciousness) of visible seizure activity within 10 minutes with sustained absence of visible seizure activity for 30 minutes following single ASM dose (primary); Time to seizure cessation; Time taken for ASM preparation and administration	N (randomised; ED) = 34 N (analysed; ED) = 34 N (randomised; Home) = 69 N (analysed; Home) = NR[1] Dose 0.2 mg/kg (max 10 mg)	Buccal midazolam N (randomised; ED) = 37 N (analysed; ED) = 37 N (randomised; Home) = 67 N (analysed; Home) = NR[1] Dose 0.2 mg/kg (max 10 mg) Intranasal midazolam N (randomised; ED) = 34 N (analysed; ED) = 34 N (randomised; Home) = 60 N (analysed; Home) = NR[1] Dose 0.2 mg/kg (max (10 mg)

					Caregiver objection to use of randomised intervention			
Momen (2015) [31]	Iran	Unblinded, randomised controlled trial	Tertiary children's hospital emergency dept.	Age ≥ 1 mth; Convulsive status epilepticus (continuous generalised convulsive seizure lasting ≥ 5 minutes) at time of presentation at emergency department	Established intravenous access on arrival at hospital; Administration of rectal or nasal benzodiazepines by parents or paramedics; Failure of parents to give verbal consent to participate; Serial seizures without recovery of consciousness between seizures; History of serious adverse reaction to study medications	Cessation of convulsive seizure activity within 10 minutes of ASM administration without seizure recurrence within 60 minutes of initial seizure cessation (primary); Time to cessation of seizure from time of ASM administration; Adverse effects	N (randomised) = 50 N (analysed) = 50 Dose 0.3 mg/kg	Rectal diazepam N (randomised) = 50 N (analysed) = 50 Dose 0.5 mg/kg
Muchohi (2008) [32]	Kenya	Open-label, non-randomised, uncontrolled trial	Hospital paediatric high dependency unit	Age 6 mths to 13 years; Features of severe malaria; Convulsion lasting ≥ 5 minutes or ≥ 3 convulsions lasting < 5 minutes within 1 hour; Parental written informed consent	Treatment with diazepam before admission to ED; Compromised cardio-respiratory function; Detectable midazolam concentrations in pre-dose blood sample; Inability to obtain parental informed consent	Cessation of visible signs of seizure activity within 10 minutes of ASM administration without respiratory depression or seizure recurrence within 6 hours (primary); Time to seizure cessation from time of ASM administration; Seizure recurrence; Respiratory depression; Death	N = 12 Dose 0.3 mg/kg	Buccal midazolam N = 8 Dose 0.3 mg/kg
Munir (2019) [33]	Pakistan	Open-label, randomised trial	Hospital paediatric department	Age 1 mth to 18 years; Admission to hospital with any acute seizure type; Parental informed consent	History of allergy to benzodiazepines; Respiratory depression; Acute diarrhoea; Status epilepticus	Time to seizure cessation from time of ASM administration; Cessation of seizure within 5 minutes of ASM administration	N (randomised) = 33 N (analysed) = 33 Dose 0.2 mg/kg	Rectal diazepam N (randomised) = 33 N (analysed) = 33 Dose 0.5 mg/kg

Abbreviations: ASM = Antiseizure medication; ED = Emergency department; NR = Not reported; PICU = Paediatric intensive care unit

Notes: (1). Home data reported as number of seizure episodes. Some participants provided data for > 1 seizure.

Table 2. Main efficacy findings for included studies

			Cessation of seizure within 5 mins of drug administration		Cessation of seizures within 10 mins of drug administration[1]		Time (mins) to seizure cessation		Recurrence of seizure within 1 hr of initial seizure cessation		Admission to ICU		Time (mins) taken for drug administration		Time (mins) from hospital arrival to drug administration	
Study	Setting	Group	%	p	%	p	Mean ± SD[2]	p	%	p	%	p	Mean ± SD	p	Mean ± SD	p
Alansari (2020) [29]	ED	IM MDZ	61.0	0.07	72.0	0.27	15.9 (28.7)	0.69	12.0	0.68	12.0	0.38	-	-	2.7 (1.6)	0.03
		BCL MDZ	46.0		63.0		17.8 (27.5)		14.0		17.0		-		3.4 (1.9)	
Mohammed (2024) [30]	ED	IM MDZ	-	-	85.3	0.51	3.47 (1.13)	< 0.001	5.9	0.40	23.5	0.89	0.96 (0.26)	0.72	-	-
		BCL MDZ	-		78.4		5.91 (1.25)		10.8		18.9		1.03 (0.31)		-	
		IN MDZ	-		88.2		3.75 (1.26)		2.9		20.6		1.05 (0.71)		-	
	Home	IM MDZ	-	-	94.2	0.76	2.95 (1.55)	< 0.001	2.9	0.48	2.9	0.87	1.37 (0.81)	0.10	-	-
		BCL MDZ	-		91.0		5.11 (1.23)		7.5		3.0		1.38 (0.38)		-	
		IN MDZ	-		93.3		3.27 (1.40)		5.0		1.7		1.92 (2.79)		-	
Momen (2015)[3] [31]	ED	IM MDZ	-	-	96.0	0.06	1.33 (0.84)	< 0.001	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.12 (0.20)	0.017
		PR DZP	-		94.0		2.98 (1.92)		-		-		-		1.49 (0.64)	
Muchohi (2008) [32]	ED	IM MDZ	-	-	50.0	NR	5.0	NR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		BCL MDZ	-		40.0		3.5		-		-		-		-	
Munir (2019) [33]	ED	IM MDZ	-	-	-	-	0.75 (0.47-1.03)[4]	< 0.0001	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		PR DZP	-		-		3.0 (1.12-4.88)[4]		-		-		-		-	

Abbreviations: BCL = Buccal; CI = Confidence interval; DZP = Diazepam; ED = Emergency department; ICU = Intensive care unit; IM = Intramuscular; IN = Intranasal; MDZ = Midazolam; NR = Not reported; PR = Per rectal; SD = Standard deviation

Notes: (1). Mohammed et al. outcome was seizure cessation within 10 minutes with absence of visible seizure activity for 30 minutes with single ASM dose. Momen et al. outcome was seizure cessation within 10 minutes without recurrence within 60 minutes (2). Mean and standard deviation where reported or calculable (3). Timed outcomes reported as median and range. Mean and standard deviations calculated from original study data provided by the authors (4). Median (range)

References

1. Chin RFM, Neville BGR, Peckham C, Bedford H, Wade A, Scott RC. Incidence, cause, and short-term outcome of convulsive status epilepticus in childhood: Prospective population-based study. The Lancet. 2006;368(9531):222-9. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(06)69043-0.

2. Trinka E, Cock H, Hesdorffer D, Rossetti AO, Scheffer IE, Shinnar S et al. A definition and classification of status epilepticus – report of the ilae task force on classification of status epilepticus. Epilepsia. 2015;56(10):1515-23. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/epi.13121.

3. Chin RFM, Neville BGR, Peckham C, Wade A, Bedford H, Scott RC. Treatment of community-onset, childhood convulsive status epilepticus: A prospective, population-based study. The Lancet Neurology. 2008;7(8):696-703. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(08)70141-8.

4. Legriel S, Azoulay E, Resche-Rigon M, Lemiale V, Mourvillier B, Kouatchet A et al. Functional outcome after convulsive status epilepticus. Critical Care Medicine. 2010;38(12):2295-303. doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181f859a6.

5. Neligan A, Shorvon SD. Prognostic factors, morbidity and mortality in tonic–clonic status epilepticus: A review. Epilepsy Research. 2011;93(1):1-10. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2010.09.003.

6. Raspall-Chaure M, Chin RFM, Neville BG, Bedford H, Scott RC. The epidemiology of convulsive status epilepticus in children: A critical review. Epilepsia. 2007;48(9):1652-63. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-1167.2007.01175.x.

7. Neville BGR, Chin RFM, Scott RC. Childhood convulsive status epilepticus: Epidemiology, management and outcome. Acta Neurologica Scandinavica. 2007;115(s186):21-4. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0404.2007.00805.x.

8. Novorol CL, Chin RFM, Scott RC. Outcome of convulsive status epilepticus: A review. Archives of Disease in Childhood. 2007;92(11):948-51. doi:10.1136/adc.2006.107516.

9. Becker L-L, Gratopp A, Prager C, Elger CE, Kaindl AM. Treatment of pediatric convulsive status epilepticus. Frontiers in Neurology. 2023;14:1175370.

10. Neligan A, Noyce AJ, Gosavi TD, Shorvon SD, Köhler S, Walker MC. Change in mortality of generalized convulsive status epilepticus in high-income countries over time: A systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA Neurology. 2019;76(8):897-905. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2019.1268.

11. Pujar SS, Martinos MM, Cortina-Borja M, Chong WKK, De Haan M, Gillberg C et al. Long-term prognosis after childhood convulsive status epilepticus: A prospective cohort study. The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health. 2018;2(2):103-11. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(17)30174-8.

12. Chin RFM. The outcomes of childhood convulsive status epilepticus. Epilepsy & Behavior. 2019;101:106286. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2019.04.039.

13. Ochoa JG, Kilgo WA. The role of benzodiazepines in the treatment of epilepsy. Current Treatment Options in Neurology. 2016;18(4):18. doi:10.1007/s11940-016-0401-x.

14. Sánchez Fernández I, Goodkin HP, Scott RC. Pathophysiology of convulsive status epilepticus. Seizure. 2019;68:16-21. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seizure.2018.08.002.

15. Walker MC. Pathophysiology of status epilepticus. Neuroscience Letters. 2018;667:84-91. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2016.12.044.

16. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Nice guideline ng217: Epilepsies in children, young people and adults. 2022. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng217/chapter/7-Treating-status-epilepticus-repeated-or-cluster-seizures-and-prolonged-seizures. Accessed 20 November 2025.

17. Blumer JL. Clinical pharmacology of midazolam in infants and children. Clinical Pharmacokinetics. 1998;35(1):37-47. doi:10.2165/00003088-199835010-00003.

18. Dundee JW, Halliday NJ, Harper KW, Brogden RN. Midazolam. Drugs. 1984;28(6):519-43. doi:10.2165/00003495-198428060-00002.

19. Nunley S, Glynn P, Rust S, Vidaurre J, Albert DVF, Patel AD. A hospital-based study on caregiver preferences on acute seizure rescue medications in pediatric patients with epilepsy: Intranasal midazolam versus rectal diazepam. Epilepsy & Behavior. 2019;92:53-6. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2018.12.007.

20. Brigo F, Nardone R, Tezzon F, Trinka E. Nonintravenous midazolam versus intravenous or rectal diazepam for the treatment of early status epilepticus: A systematic review with meta-analysis. Epilepsy & Behavior. 2015;49:325-36. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2015.02.030.

21. Ashrafi MR, Khosroshahi N, Karimi P, Malamiri RA, Bavarian B, Zarch AV et al. Efficacy and usability of buccal midazolam in controlling acute prolonged convulsive seizures in children. European Journal of Paediatric Neurology. 2010;14(5):434-8. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpn.2010.05.009.

22. Holsti M, Dudley N, Schunk J, Adelgais K, Greenberg R, Olsen C et al. Intranasal midazolam vs rectal diazepam for the home treatment of acute seizures in pediatric patients with epilepsy. Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine. 2010;164(8):747-53. doi:10.1001/archpediatrics.2010.130.

23. Holsti M, Sill BL, Firth SD, Filloux FM, Joyce SM, Furnival RA. Prehospital intranasal midazolam for the treatment of pediatric seizures. Pediatric Emergency Care. 2007;23(3):148-53. doi:10.1097/PEC.0b013e3180328c92.

24. McMullan J, Sasson C, Pancioli A, Silbergleit R. Midazolam versus diazepam for the treatment of status epilepticus in children and young adults: A meta-analysis. Acad Emerg Med. 2010;17(6):575-82. doi:10.1111/j.1553-2712.2010.00751.x.

25. Bhattacharyya M, Kalra V, Gulati S. Intranasal midazolam vs rectal diazepam in acute childhood seizures. Pediatric Neurology. 2006;34(5):355-9. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pediatrneurol.2005.09.006.

26. McIntyre J, Robertson S, Norris E, Appleton R, Whitehouse WP, Phillips B et al. Safety and efficacy of buccal midazolam versus rectal diazepam for emergency treatment of seizures in children: A randomised controlled trial. The Lancet. 2005;366(9481):205-10. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(05)66909-7.

27. Scott RC, Besag FMC, Neville BGR. Buccal midazolam and rectal diazepam for treatment of prolonged seizures in childhood and adolescence: A randomised trial. The Lancet. 1999;353(9153):623-6. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(98)06425-3.

28. Glauser T, Shinnar S, Gloss D, Alldredge B, Arya R, Bainbridge J et al. Evidence-based guideline: Treatment of convulsive status epilepticus in children and adults: Report of the guideline committee of the american epilepsy society. Epilepsy Currents. 2016;16(1):48-61.

29. Alansari K, Barkat M, Mohamed AH, Al Jawala SA, Othman SA. Intramuscular versus buccal midazolam for pediatric seizures: A randomized double-blinded trial. Pediatr Neurol. 2020;109:28-34. doi:10.1016/j.pediatrneurol.2020.03.011.

30. Mohammed MZ, Elagouza I, El Gaafary M, El-Garhy R, El-Rashidy O. Intranasal versus buccal versus intramuscular midazolam for the home and emergency treatment of acute seizures in pediatric patients: A randomized controlled trial. Pediatr Neurol. 2024;158:135-43. doi:10.1016/j.pediatrneurol.2024.06.014.

31. Momen AA, Azizi Malamiri R, Nikkhah A, Jafari M, Fayezi A, Riahi K et al. Efficacy and safety of intramuscular midazolam versus rectal diazepam in controlling status epilepticus in children. Eur J Paediatr Neurol. 2015;19(2):149-54. doi:10.1016/j.ejpn.2014.11.007.

32. Muchohi SN, Kokwaro GO, Ogutu BR, Edwards G, Ward SA, Newton CR. Pharmacokinetics and clinical efficacy of midazolam in children with severe malaria and convulsions. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2008;66(4):529-38. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2125.2008.03239.x.

33. Munir R, Iqbal Z, Hassan Musanna S. Study of the comparison of safety and efficacy of intramuscular midazolam versus rectal diazepam act as anticonvulsant in children. Indo American Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2019;6(4):8692-6.

34. Ramgopal S, Owusu-Ansah S, Crowe RP, Okubo M, Martin-Gill C. Association of midazolam route of administration and need for recurrent dosing among children with seizures cared for by emergency medical services. Epilepsia. 2024;65(5):1294-303. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/epi.17940.

35. Cheng Y, Yao F, Chen Y. A comparative analysis of prehospital emergency treatments: Midazolam intramuscularly, diazepam enema, and chloral hydrate enema for pediatric convulsions. Altern Ther Health Med. 2023;29(8):121-7.

36. Guterman EL, Sporer KA, Newman TB, Crowe RP, Lowenstein DH, Josephson SA et al. Real-world midazolam use and outcomes with out-of-hospital treatment of status epilepticus in the united states. Annals of Emergency Medicine. 2022;80(4):319-28. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annemergmed.2022.05.024.

37. Shaikh RG, Ramanujan B, Singh RK, Vibha D, Mehta S, Appukuttan R et al. The in-midaz study - intranasal midazolam in aborting seizures - an epilepsy monitoring unit based randomized controlled trial for efficacy. Epilepsy Res. 2022;188:107037. doi:10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2022.107037.

38. Whitfield D, Bosson N, Kaji AH, Gausche-Hill M. The effectiveness of intranasal midazolam for the treatment of prehospital pediatric seizures: A non-inferiority study. Prehospital Emergency Care. 2022;26(3):339-47. doi:10.1080/10903127.2021.1897197.

39. Hasan SU, Pervez A, Bhatty S, Shamim S, Naeem A, Naseeb MW. Termination of seizures in the paediatric age group, best benzodiazepine and route of administration: A network meta-analysis. Eur J Neurosci. 2022;56(3):4234-45. doi:10.1111/ejn.15732.

40. McTague A, Martland T, Appleton R. Drug management for acute tonic-clonic convulsions including convulsive status epilepticus in children. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2018;1(1):Cd001905. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001905.pub3.

41. Jain P, Sharma S, Dua T, Barbui C, Das RR, Aneja S. Efficacy and safety of anti-epileptic drugs in patients with active convulsive seizures when no iv access is available: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Epilepsy Research. 2016;122:47-55. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2016.02.006.

42. Arya R, Kothari H, Zhang Z, Han B, Horn PS, Glauser TA. Efficacy of nonvenous medications for acute convulsive seizures: A network meta-analysis. Neurology. 2015;85(21):1859-68. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000002142.

43. Zhao Z-y, Wang H-y, Wen B, Yang Z-b, Feng K, Fan J-c. A comparison of midazolam, lorazepam, and diazepam for the treatment of status epilepticus in children: A network meta-analysis. Journal of Child Neurology. 2016;31(9):1093-107.

44. Mula M. New non-intravenous routes for benzodiazepines in epilepsy: A clinician perspective. CNS Drugs. 2017;31(1):11-7. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40263-016-0398-4.

45. Rainbow J, Browne G, Lam L. Controlling seizures in the prehospital setting: Diazepam or midazolam? Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health. 2002;38(6):582-6. doi:https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1440-1754.2002.00046.x.

46. Portela JL, Garcia PC, Piva JP, Barcelos A, Bruno F, Branco R et al. Intramuscular midazolam versus intravenous diazepam for treatment of seizures in the pediatric emergency department: A randomized clinical trial. Med Intensiva. 2015;39(3):160-6. doi:10.1016/j.medin.2014.04.003.

47. Ivaturi V, Kriel R, Brundage R, Loewen G, Mansbach H, Cloyd J. Bioavailability of intranasal vs. Rectal diazepam. Epilepsy Research. 2013;103(2):254-61. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2012.07.018.

48. Rey E, Tréluyer J-M, Pons G. Pharmacokinetic optimisation of benzodiazepine therapy for acute seizures. Clinical Pharmacokinetics. 1999;36(6):409-24. doi:10.2165/00003088-199936060-00003.

49. Dooley JM. Rectal use of benzodiazepines. Epilepsia. 1998;39(S1):S24-S7. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-1157.1998.tb05111.x.

50. Kriel RL, Cloyd JC, Hadsall RS, Carlson AM, Floren KL, Jones-Saete CM. Home use of rectal diazepam for cluster and prolonged seizures: Efficacy, adverse reactions, quality of life, and cost analysis. Pediatric Neurology. 1991;7(1):13-7. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0887-8994(91)90099-7.

51. Penovich P, Wheless JW, Hogan RE, Guerra C, Cook DF, Carrazana E et al. Examining the patient and caregiver experience with diazepam nasal spray for seizure clusters: Results from an exit survey of a phase 3, open-label, repeat-dose safety study. Epilepsy & Behavior. 2021;121:108013. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2021.108013.

52. Alford EL, Wheless JW, Phelps SJ. Treatment of generalized convulsive status epilepticus in pediatric patients. The Journal of Pediatric Pharmacology and Therapeutics. 2015;20(4):260-89. doi:10.5863/1551-6776-20.4.260.

53. RAFA Labs Ltd. Midazolam hydrochloride autoinjector prescribing information. 2022. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2022/216359s000lbl.pdf. Accessed 20 November 2025.

54. Ramgopal S, McCans K, Martin-Gill C, Owusu-Ansah S. Variation in prehospital protocols for pediatric seizure within the United States. Pediatric Emergency Care. 2021;37(12):e1331-e8. doi:10.1097/pec.0000000000002029.

55. Silverman EC, Sporer KA, Lemieux JM, Brown JF, Koenig KL, Gausche-Hill M et al. Prehospital care for the adult and pediatric seizure patient: Current evidence-based recommendations. Western Journal of Emergency Medicine. 2017;18(3):419-36. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.5811/westjem.2016.12.32066.

56. Electronic Medicines Compendium (emc). Midazolam 2mg/ml solution for injection/infusion: Summary of product characteristics (smpc). https://www.medicines.org.uk/emc/product/6418/smpc. Accessed 20 November 2025.