



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/101851/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Chambers, J., Thornhill, M., Shanson, D. et al. (2016) Antibiotic prophylaxis of endocarditis - Authors' reply. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 16 (7). pp. 774-775. ISSN: 1473-3099

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(16\)30128-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(16)30128-1)

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Sir

We thank Million et al who argue against antibiotic prophylaxis (AP) for all patients having dental procedures. However our point was significantly different. We wrote to support AP only in patients at high risk of infective endocarditis (IE) (principally with prosthetic valves or prior IE) having high-risk dental procedures (principally extractions and scaling).

Two of the studies used to construct Million et al's figure included only patients with native valve disease while the third included 24% prosthetic valves. The quoted efficacy for AP was 46%, 49% (1) and 91%. This is slightly at variance with Million et al. because van der Meer (1) found an OR for first-time endocarditis of 0.51 and for recurrent endocarditis of 2.13. Van der Meer et al used the first figure (1) while Million et al chose the second. Studies of prosthetic valves report better efficacy. Duval et al (2) showed a 1/10,700 incidence of IE in patients with prosthetic valves having unprotected dental procedures compared with only 1/149,000 in patients with prosthetic or native valve disease protected by AP. Horstkotte (3) showed no cases in 229 patients with prosthetic valves protected by AP compared with 2 in 117 having unprotected dental procedures.

We disagree that bacteraemia with oral Streptococci (OVS) is common before extractions. Approximately 2% have positive cultures before extraction compared with up to 65% immediately after extraction (5). Infective endocarditis with OVS is consistently reported up to 30 days after extractions and deep scaling (1,3).

It is simplistic to believe that IE from OVS is caused either by poor dental hygiene or dental procedures as if these were mutually exclusive. There is good evidence for both. Dental surveillance and attention to hygiene might be expected to reduce the

incidence of IE as a result of poor hygiene as suggested by Million et al based on the paper of Strom et al (5). However this study also showed a significant association between IE and dental extractions ($P=0.03$)(5). AP is needed to target those smaller number of cases caused by invasive dental procedures.

There is no evidence to show that withholding AP is safe in high-risk patients, rather the contrary. We therefore disagree with Million et al that the NICE stance is evidence-based and instead favour guidance produced on behalf of the American Heart Association and European Society of Cardiology by clinicians familiar with the complexities of this disease.

John Chambers, Martin Thornhill, David Shanson, Bernard Prendergast

References

1. Van der Meer JTM, van Wijk W, Thompson J, Vandembroucke JP, Valkenburg HA, Michel MF. Efficacy of antibiotic prophylaxis for prevention of native-valve endocarditis. *Lancet* 1992;339:135-9.
2. Duval X, Alla F, Hoen B, Danielou F, Larrieu S, Delahaye F, Leport C, Briancon S. Estimated risk of endocarditis in adults with predisposing cardiac conditions undergoing dental procedures with or without antibiotic prophylaxis. *CID* 2006;42:e102-7.
3. Horstkotte D, Rosin H, Friedrichs W, Loogen F. Contribution for choosing the optimal prophylaxis of bacterial endocarditis. *Eur Heart J* 1987;8(Suppl J):379-81.

4. Shanson D, New British and American guidelines for the antibiotic prophylaxis of endocarditis : do the changes make sense? A critical review. *Current Opinion in Infectious Diseases* 2008;21:191-199.

5. Strom BL, Abrutyn E, Berlin JA, Kinman JL, Feldman RS, Stolley PD, Levison ME, Korzeniowski OM, Kaye D. Dental and cardiac risk factors for infective endocarditis. *Ann Int Med* 1998;129:761-9.