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NICE guidance written in 2008, and revised in 2015 (1), no longer recommends antibiotic prophylaxis for infective endocarditis (IE) in patients at high-risk of IE having high-risk dental procedures. This remains different from every international guideline (2) including a 2015 European Society of Cardiology revision (3). The European guideline committee (3) considered, but rejected, the NICE view. How has this important difference in advice arisen and what are its implications?

The core NICE committee consists of the same individuals, regardless of the subject under review. Detailed experience of the clinical background may not be seen as critical in considering drug therapies or technologies for which data from randomised controlled trials exist. However, judging the advisability of antibiotic prophylaxis for IE requires the understanding of complex observational or case-matched clinical and animal studies. Arguably, this requires expertise and experience in the subject and is better suited to professional bodies than to NICE.

The NICE revision committee made a number of errors, stating, for example, that ‘people with prosthetic valves do not appear to be at increased odds of developing IE than people without prosthetic valves based on two studies’. In fact, the two studies were not relevant to the question and the annual incidence of prosthetic valve IE is 0.3-1.2% (3), 10-120 times the estimate within the general population. Another error was to note ‘the lack of data on side effects (including anaphylaxis) from antibiotic prophylaxis’. To date,
there have been no reports in the world literature of fatal anaphylaxis after oral amoxicillin prophylaxis for IE (4,5).

NICE considered that there was no good evidence of significant bacteraemia following invasive dental procedures (1), but examined only studies that included negative pre-procedural blood cultures. However, most of these cultures were positive for skin commensals, not orally derived viridans streptococci. Viridans streptococci were very rare pre-procedure, but were isolated in 35-65% of blood cultures immediately following dental extraction in studies excluded by NICE (6). Furthermore, observational or case-control studies show that IE may be associated with some dental procedures, including extractions, deep-fillings and scaling (7,8). Of course, IE may also occur with bacteraemia associated with daily activities.

NICE also considered that there was no evidence for antibiotic prophylaxis being effective. Although there has been no randomised trial, a number of observational clinical studies show a benefit in high-risk groups (7,9) and animal data demonstrate that a single dose of amoxicillin can prevent streptococcal bacteraemia and IE (7,10). In a recent analysis (11), 277 prescriptions of antibiotic prophylaxis were needed to prevent one case of IE.

Numerous studies show a background increase in the incidence of IE (1). However, a recent study (11) showed that the slope of this increase rose in the UK in the years after introduction of the NICE guidance in March 2008. There has been subsequent debate about the timing of the change in slope
and whether the data are better fitted with a curve than a straight line, but there has been no disagreement about the existence of the change. The study was limited by the lack of microbiological information and it is surprising that IE-related mortality did not rise in parallel with incidence. However, the mortality of IE caused by oral streptococci is lower than IE caused by other organisms and a US study (11) has shown a rise in IE caused by Streptococci in the same time-period.

NICE guidance might appear to simplify dental practice. However, the nature of informed consent obliges dentists to make patients aware of the different guidelines, especially if a patient is at high clinical risk or has a particular concern about antibiotic prophylaxis or IE. The dentist would then need to let the patient make up his or her own mind whether or not to receive antibiotic prophylaxis. This process would therefore be significantly simpler if all guidelines were in agreement.

Conclusion
NICE is most effective when considering drug therapies or technologies for which randomised controlled trial data exist. Expert professional bodies might be expected to be more appropriate for complex clinical judgements, such as the advisability of antibiotic prophylaxis of IE. We suggest that the recently updated European Society of Cardiology guidance (3), remains clinically most appropriate.
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