

This is a repository copy of *Incidence and nature of adverse reactions to antibiotics used as endocarditis prophylaxis*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/115892/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Thornhill, M.H. orcid.org/0000-0003-0681-4083, Dayer, M.J., Prendergast, B. et al. (3 more authors) (2015) Incidence and nature of adverse reactions to antibiotics used as endocarditis prophylaxis. JOURNAL OF ANTIMICROBIAL CHEMOTHERAPY, 70 (8). pp. 2382-2388. ISSN 0305-7453

https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkv115

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced version of an article accepted for publication in Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy following peer review. The version of record Martin H. Thornhill, Mark J. Dayer, Bernard Prendergast, Larry M. Baddour, Simon Jones, Peter B. Lockhart; Incidence and nature of adverse reactions to antibiotics used as endocarditis prophylaxis. J Antimicrob Chemother 2015; 70 (8): 2382-2388., is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkv115.

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

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.



Incidence and Nature of Adverse Reactions to Antibiotics Used as Endocarditis Prophylaxis

Martin H Thornhill^{1,2*}, Mark J Dayer³, Bernard Prendergast⁴, Larry M.
Baddour⁵, Simon Jones⁶ and Peter B Lockhart²

- ¹Professor of Translational Research in Dentistry, Unit of Oral & Maxillofacial
 Surgery & Medicine, University of Sheffield School of Clinical Dentistry,
 Claremont Crescent, Sheffield S10 2TA, UK.
- ²Adjunct Professor of Oral Medicine, Department of Oral Medicine, Carolinas
 Medical Center, Charlotte, NC 28203, USA.
- ³Consultant Cardiologist, Department of Cardiology, Taunton and Somerset NHS
- 11 Trust, Taunton, Somerset, TA1 5DA, UK.
- ⁴Consultant Cardiologist and Director of Cardiothoracic Services, Department of
- 13 Cardiology, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, OX3 9DU, UK.
- ⁵Professor of Medicine and Chair, Division of Infectious Diseases, Mayo Clinic
 College of Medicine, Rochester, MN 55905, USA.
- ⁶Professor of Epidemiology, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey GU2
 7XH UK.
- ²Professor of Oral Medicine, Department of Oral Medicine, Carolinas Medical
 Center, Charlotte, NC 28203, USA.
- 20 ***Correspondence to:**

- 21 Prof. Martin Thornhill, Tel: +44 (0)114-271-7857, Fax: +44 (0)114-271-7863,
- 22 Email: <u>m.thornhill@sheffield.ac.uk</u>

23 Short Running Title:

- 24 Adverse Reactions to Endocarditis Prophylaxis
- 25 Key Words:
- 26 Adverse Drug Reaction, Amoxicillin, Clindamycin, Dental

27 **Synopsis**

28	Objectives: Antibiotic-prophylaxis administration prior to invasive dental
29	procedures has been a leading focus of infective endocarditis prevention.
30	However, there have been long-standing concerns about the risk of adverse drug
31	reactions as a result of this practice. The objective of this study was to identify the
32	incidence and nature of adverse reactions to amoxicillin and clindamycin
33	prophylaxis used to prevent infective endocarditis.
34	Methods: We obtained antibiotic-prophylaxis prescribing data for England from
35	January 2004 to March 2014 from the NHS Business Services Authority, and
36	adverse drug reaction data from the Medicine and Health products Regulatory
37	Agency 'Yellow Card' reporting scheme for prescriptions of the standard
38	antibiotic-prophylaxis protocol of a single 3g oral dose of amoxicillin or a single
39	600mg oral dose of clindamycin for those allergic to penicillin.
40	Results: The reported adverse drug reaction rate for amoxicillin antibiotic-
41	prophylaxis was 0 fatal reactions for nearly 3 million prescriptions and 22.62 non-
42	fatal reactions/million prescriptions. For clindamycin, it was 13 fatal and 149 non-
43	fatal reactions/million prescriptions. Most clindamycin adverse drug reactions
44	were Clostridium difficile infections.

45 Conclusions: Antibiotic-prophylaxis adverse drug reaction reporting rates in England were low, particularly for amoxicillin, and lower than previous estimates. 46 47 This suggests that amoxicillin antibiotic-prophylaxis is comparatively safe for patients without a history of amoxicillin allergy. The use of clindamycin 48 antibiotic-prophylaxis was, however, associated with significant rates of fatal and 49 50 non-fatal adverse drug reactions associated with C. difficile infections. These were 51 higher than expected and similar to those for other doses, durations and routes of 52 clindamycin administration.

53 Introduction

Infective endocarditis (IE) is an infection of the endocardium that is associated with high morbidity and mortality.¹ Bacteria from the oral cavity, particularly oral viridans group streptococci, are implicated as the causal organisms in approximately 35-45% of cases.²⁻⁶ Consequently, dentists have historically given antibiotic prophylaxis (AP) to patients at risk of developing IE prior to performing invasive dental procedures.

The aim of AP is to reduce or eliminate bacteremia caused by procedures⁷⁻¹¹ that may lead to IE in susceptible individuals. However, there has never been a randomized clinical trial to demonstrate the effectiveness of AP,¹² and there is little evidence to support it's effectiveness.^{3, 5, 9} Furthermore, concerns have been expressed that the cost and potential adverse effects of AP may outweigh its benefits.¹³⁻¹⁶

66 Until recently, it was the standard of care in most parts of the world to provide AP 67 to patients at 'high-risk' (previous IE, prosthetic heart valves or valves repaired 68 with prosthetic material, unrepaired cyanotic congenital heart disease, or certain 69 repaired congenital heart defects) or 'moderate-risk' (previous rheumatic fever, 70 heart murmur, or evidence of native valve disease) of IE.

However, in March 2008, the UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) produced guidance recommending cessation of AP for preventing IE.¹⁷ In contrast, the American Heart Association (AHA)¹⁸ and the European Society for Cardiology (ESC)¹⁹ produced guidelines in 2007 and 2009, respectively, that recommended cessation of AP only for individuals at 'moderaterisk' of IE.

77	The move to reduce AP prescribing was driven not just by lack of evidence for
78	efficacy, but also by concerns about the risk of adverse drug reactions, the risk of
79	increasing antibiotic resistance, and cost. The aim of this study was to quantify the
80	risk and nature of adverse events associated with AP in England.

81 Methods

Prior to introduction of the NICE guidelines, a single 3g oral dose of amoxicillin 82 83 (or a 600mg oral dose of clindamycin in penicillin-allergic individuals) was 84 prescribed before invasive dental procedures as AP to those at 'moderate-risk' or 'high-risk' of developing IE. This dosage schedule and route of administration for 85 amoxicillin and clindamycin are almost exclusively used for AP purposes.^{20, 21} 86 Data on their prescribing between January 2004 and January 2014 were obtained 87 from the National Health Service **Business** Services Authority 88 (http://www.nhsbsa.nhs.uk/prescriptions). We have previously published data on 89 AP prescribing for earlier periods.^{20, 21} 90

The Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) provide 91 92 adverse drug reaction (ADR) data using the 'Yellow Card' reporting scheme (http://www.mhra.gov.uk/Safetyinformation/Medicinesinformation/index.htm). 93 ADR data were available for any dose, duration or route of administration of amoxicillin 94 for the period July 1st 1963 until August 29th 2014, and for clindamycin from July 95 1st 1963 until August 20th 2014. For a single 3g oral dose of amoxicillin, however, 96 it was only possible to extract data for the period from January 13th 1980 until 97 January 15th 2014, and for a single 600mg oral dose of clindamycin from 98 December 18th 1969 until January 15th 2014. To estimate the ADR incidence for a 99 100 single 3g oral dose of amoxicillin or a single 600mg oral dose of clindamycin, monthly prescribing data for the period January 2004 to March 2013 were used. 101 For earlier periods, the mean number of prescriptions per month during the period 102 103 January 2004 – March 2008 was used to extrapolate the data.

104 Unless specifically stated otherwise, the data presented are for England only.

105

106 **Results**

107 Prescribing of amoxicillin antibiotic prophylaxis

108 Monthly prescribing data for all prescriptions of a single 3g oral dose of

amoxicillin are shown in Figure 1(a) with breakdown according to prescriber

110 status in Figure 1(b).

111 Before the introduction of the NICE guidelines, 93.4% of all prescriptions for a

single 3g oral dose of amoxicillin were written by dentists and 6.3% were written

by general practitioners. Prescribing by hospitals (0.2%) and nurses (<0.1%) was infrequent.

Following introduction of the NICE guidelines, there was a dramatic (87.8%) fall

in the prescribing of amoxicillin AP from a mean of 8,395 prescriptions per month

before NICE, to a mean of 1,026 prescriptions per month in the 6 months from

118 July 2013 until January 2014 (p < 0.001). Following the NICE guidelines, there

119 was a small reduction in the proportion of prescriptions written by dentists (from

120 93.4% to 89.3%) and a compensatory rise in the proportion written by general

121 practitioners (from 6.3% to 10.2%).

122 Prescribing of clindamycin antibiotic prophylaxis

123 Data are shown for prescriptions for a single 600mg dose of oral clindamycin 124 (Figures 1(a) and 1(c)). Before the introduction of the NICE guidelines, 88.8% of 125 all prescriptions for clindamycin AP were written by dentists and 10.9% by 126 general practitioners. Prescribing by hospitals (0.2%) and nurses (<0.1%) was 127 infrequent. Following introduction of the NICE guidelines, there was a marked decline (95.2%) in prescribing of clindamycin AP from a mean of 2,504 prescriptions per month before NICE, to a mean of 120 prescriptions per month in the 6 months from July 2013 until January 2014 (p<0.001). Following the NICE guidelines, there was a substantial reduction in the proportion of prescriptions written by dentists (from 88.8% to 66.6%) and a compensatory rise in the proportion written by general practitioners (from 10.9% to 32.5%).

Taken together, there was an 89.5% reduction in the number of courses of AP
prescribed (amoxicillin or clindamycin) following introduction of the NICE
guidelines, from a mean of 10,900 per month in the period January 2004 to March
2008 to a mean of 1,146 in the last 6 months of study (p<0.001) (Figure 1(a)).

139

140 Incidence of amoxicillin related adverse events

141 Analysis of ADR reports for all doses, duration and routes of administration of 142 amoxicillin (as a single active constituent) during the period July 1963 to August 2014 revealed 73 fatal reports, 5 of which were recorded as immune system and 143 13 as allergy-related skin disorders. There were also 3072 non-fatal reports, 144 including 304 immune system and 2063 allergy-related skin reports. Analysis of 145 146 amoxicillin prescribing data for all purposes between 2004-2007 demonstrated an average of 12,896,805 courses per annum. Assuming a constant prescribing rate 147 over the 51 years of data availability, this allows a crude estimate of 0.11 fatal and 148 149 4.67 non-fatal reactions per million courses of amoxicillin prescribed. Since amoxicillin prescribing has gradually increased over the period of ADR reporting, 150 151 this probably represents an underestimate of the current frequency of reported adverse events for amoxicillin. 152

In contrast, analysis of ADR reports (where relevant data were available 153 concerning dose and route of administration) revealed no fatal reaction reports 154 following a single 3g oral dose of amoxicillin during the data-recording period 155 from January 1980 to January 2014. There were, however, 67 non-fatal reaction 156 reports in the same period, 16 of which were recorded as immune system disorders 157 158 (anaphylactic/allergic reactions) and 38 as allergy-related skin disorders (rashes, angioedema, pruritis and urticaria). Over the same period, we estimate that 159 160 2,961,900 courses of a single 3g oral dose of amoxicillin were prescribed. Using 161 these figures, a crude estimate of the adverse reaction reporting rate was 0 fatal 162 and 22.62 non-fatal reports per million courses of prescribed amoxicillin AP, (of which 18 could be allergy-related). For the period before introduction of the NICE 163 164 guidelines, this equates to 0 fatal and 2.28 non-fatal (but reportable) reactions per annum. For the level of AP prescribing during the most recent 6 months of the 165 post-NICE guidelines period, this equates to 0 fatal and 0.28 non-fatal reports per 166 167 annum.

168 Incidence of clindamycin related adverse events

The association of clindamycin with C. difficile infection is well documented and 169 accounted for 41 (77.4%) of 53 fatalities reported for clindamycin between July 170 171 1963 and August 2014 (32 reported as C. difficile infections and 9 as gastrointestinal disorders). Only 2 fatalities were reported as immune- (1) or 172 allergy-related skin (1) disorders. During the same period, 1273 non-fatal reactions 173 174 were reported (including 410 gastrointestinal, 102 infections, 19 immune system and 366 allergy-related skin disorder reactions). Over the 4 years 2004-2007, the 175 176 average number of courses of clindamycin prescribed was 91,950 per annum. This allows a crude estimate that 11.3 fatal and 271.5 non-fatal reactions occurred per 177

million courses of clindamycin. This may represent an underestimate since the
prescribing of clindamycin has gradually increased over the period of adverse drug
reaction reporting.

181 When analysis was limited to reports relating to a single 600mg oral dose of 182 clindamycin during the data-recording period of January 1969 to January 2014, there were 15 fatalities, including 1 gastrointestinal (due to colitis), 13 infections 183 (12 due to C. difficile infection and 1 due to peritonitis) and 1 due to vasculitis. In 184 addition, there were 178 non-fatal reactions reported (including 125 185 gastrointestinal, 17 infections, 1 immune and 60 allergy related skin disorder 186 187 reactions). Over the same period, we estimate that 1,193,502 courses of a single 600mg oral dose of clindamycin were prescribed. This figure allows a crude 188 189 estimate of 12.6 fatal and 149.1 non-fatal reported reactions per million courses of 190 clindamycin AP prescribed. For the period before introduction of the NICE guidelines, this equates to 0.38 fatal and 4.48 non-fatal reports per annum. For the 191 level of AP prescribing during the most recent 6 months of the post-NICE 192 193 guidelines period, this equates to 0.02 fatal and 0.21 non-fatal reports per annum.

In summary, the data suggest that AP in England led to 0.38 fatal and 6.76 nonfatal reported reactions per annum (the vast majority related to clindamycin) before introduction of the NICE guidelines. We estimate that, as a result of the reduction in AP prescribing, the rates fell to 0.02 fatal and 0.49 non-fatal reported reactions per annum since NICE - a fall of 0.37 fatal and 6.27 non-fatal ADR reports per annum.

200 **Discussion**

201 Adverse reactions to amoxicillin

The risk of fatal anaphylaxis with penicillin has previously been estimated at 202 1:100,000 and is higher in those receiving parenteral rather than oral penicillin.²² 203 Clemens and Ransohoff²³ estimated the death rate associated with oral penicillin 204 to be closer to 0.9 deaths per million courses and the severe and mild ADR rates to 205 be 400 and 2,400 per million courses, respectively. However, the risk associated 206 with amoxicillin is less well documented. In a cost-effectiveness analysis of the 207 use of AP to prevent IE, Agha et al. cited a death rate of 20 per million and a non-208 fatal hypersensitivity rate of 20,000 per million for amoxicillin or ampicillin.¹⁴ 209 However, this was not for the specific dose and route of administration used for 210 AP and did not differentiate between parenteral or oral antibiotic administration. 211 In contrast, Devereux et al. estimated that fatal allergic reactions to oral 212 amoxicillin occurred with a frequency of 0.9 per million patients.²⁴ However, 213 214 Devereux et al. derived this figure from the work of Clemens and Ransohoff, which related to penicillin rather than amoxicillin. Again, these figures were for 215 any dose or duration of penicillin and not for the specific dose of amoxicillin and 216 route of administration used for AP. 217

Our analysis of ADR reports and prescribing data for all doses, duration and routes of administration of amoxicillin produced an estimate of 0.1 fatal and 4.7 nonfatal reactions per million courses of amoxicillin. This is considerably lower than the rate of fatal (0.9/million) or severe (400/million) reactions calculated by Clemens and Ransohoff.²³ Looking specifically at the risk associated with a single 3g oral dose of amoxicillin as used for AP in the UK, no fatal ADR reactions were reported over a period encompassing nearly 3 million prescriptions. This suggests that the incidence of fatal ADRs associated with a single 3g oral dose of amoxicillin is considerably less than previously estimated for AP related ADR, or that for other doses/routes of amoxicillin administration. However, at 22.62 per million prescriptions, the rate of non-fatal ADR associated with amoxicillin AP in the UK, while considerably less than previous estimates,²³ appears similar to that for all other doses and routes of administration of amoxicillin in the UK.

231 Adverse reactions to clindamycin

Although the association of clindamycin with C. difficile infection is well 232 established,²⁵ estimates for its frequency range from 0.01% to 10%.²⁶⁻²⁹ In 233 contrast, the occurrence of other ADR to clindamycin, such as anaphylaxis, is 234 thought to be rare.^{30, 31} Our data suggest a rate of 11 fatal and 270 non-fatal 235 236 reactions of all types per million courses of clindamycin. This is lower than previous reports in the literature, although our study examines the community-237 wide use of clindamycin, whereas previous studies were largely performed in 238 hospital settings and among patients more susceptible to C. difficile infection. 239

With regard to the use of a single 600mg oral dose of clindamycin for AP, there 240 are no reliable data that address the incidence of ADR. It had been thought that use 241 of a single dose of clindamycin for AP purposes would not predispose to C. 242 difficile infection.³² However, there have been 5 case reports following dental use 243 of clindamycin,³³ including one specifically related to the use of clindamycin for 244 AP.³⁴ For an assessment of the cost-effectiveness of AP in preventing IE, Agha 245 estimated a fatal ADR rate of 0 and a non-fatal ADR rate of 0.004 for 246 clindamycin.¹⁴ In our study, we estimated a rate of 13 fatal and 149 non-fatal 247 248 reported ADR per million courses of clindamycin AP, the majority related to C.

249 difficile infection. Clearly, this is a much higher fatal ADR rate than previously estimated and similar to our rates for all other uses of clindamycin (11/million). 250 251 While the non-fatal ADR rate was considerably less than previously estimated (4000/million),¹⁴ it was again similar to our rates for all other uses of clindamycin 252 (270/million). These data suggest that use of clindamycin for AP carries a 253 significant risk of ADR that is very similar to the risk associated with the use of 254 clindamycin for treating infections. In the literature, risk factors for developing 255 clostridium difficile infections, aside from antibiotic use, include age and the use 256 of proton pump inhibitors.^{35, 36} Increasing age, malignancy, chronic renal failure 257 and increased co-morbidity are thought to be risk factors for a poor outcome.³⁷ 258 Our study also provides human confirmatory data to support a recent mouse study 259 260 that identified profound changes in intestinal microbiota leading to C. difficile infection following a single dose of clindamycin.³⁸ 261

Assuming that the change in AP prescribing that occurred following introduction 262 of the NICE guidelines did not alter the rate at which ADR occurred, it is possible 263 to calculate the likely impact of the NICE guidelines on the number of ADR 264 occurring each year as a result of AP prescribing. With a mean of 8,395 265 prescriptions for amoxicillin AP per month before NICE and 1,026 after, the mean 266 annual reported ADR rate would have been 0 fatal and 0.19 non-fatal reactions 267 before NICE and 0 fatal and 0.02 non-fatal reactions after - in both cases very low. 268 269 For clindamycin AP, with 2,504 prescriptions per month before NICE and 120 after, the mean annual reported ADR rate would have been 0.03 fatal and 0.37270 non-fatal reactions before NICE and <0.002 fatal and 0.02 non-fatal reactions 271 after. 272

This raises a question over the suitability of clindamycin as an alternative for AP 273 in those who report allergy to penicillins, particularly in those countries where AP 274 is still the recommended standard of care. Recent studies have suggest that rates of 275 cross-reaction between penicillins and first- and second-generation cephalosporins 276 are much lower than previously thought and that cephalosporins are associated 277 with low rates of serious ADR compared to clindamycin.³⁹⁻⁴² Perhaps it is time to 278 re-evaluate if cephalosporins, or other antibiotics, would be a safer alternative to 279 clindamycin for AP purposes in those with a history of allergy to penicillins. 280

281 Antibiotic prophylaxis prescribing

Before introduction of the NICE guidelines in March 2008, there were an average 282 283 of 8395 prescriptions per month for a single 3g oral dose of amoxicillin and 2504 per month for a single 600mg oral dose of clindamycin. The vast majority were 284 issued by dentists, a small proportion by general practitioners and a tiny fraction 285 286 by hospitals and nurses. Approximately 23% of patients requiring AP therefore had clindamycin. The reasons for this are likely a combination of self-reported 287 allergy, and because the older guidelines in place in the UK, prior to the NICE 288 guidelines, suggested that if a patient had had amoxicillin in the previous month 289 then they should receive clindamycin as AP. Although we are not aware of any 290 other studies of self-reported penicillin/amoxicillin hypersensitivity rates in the 291 primary care dental setting, the rate reported in the primary care medical setting is 292 approximately half this figure.⁴³⁻⁴⁵ The true rate of penicillin allergy is likely to be 293 294 much lower however. Around 2-5% of patients reporting a penicillin "allergy" are found to be allergic when formally tested, and the remainder will tolerate 295 penicillin use.⁴⁶⁻⁴⁸ This has raised concerns that many patients labelled penicillin 296 297 allergic, but who are in fact not allergic, are denied penicillins in favour of

antibiotics with potentially worse side effects such as clindamycin, vancomycin, or
quinolones.⁴¹ Better screening of patients with self-reported penicillin allergy,
through better questioning and/or formal allergy testing, could significantly reduce
the number of individuals denied penicillins.^{39, 41, 43, 46-48}

302 Following introduction of the NICE guidelines, there was a highly significant fall in the prescribing of both AP preparations (87.8%) for amoxicillin, 95.2% for 303 clindamycin). This fall affected prescribing by dentists and general practitioners 304 but was proportionately higher amongst dentists. With the fall in AP prescribing 305 the proportion of patients receiving clindamycin also fell from a fairly steady 306 307 ~23% before the NICE guidelines to just 10% in the last six months studied. This 308 fall may reflect the fact that after the NICE guidelines, for patients with a self-309 reported penicillin allergy, the practitioner was more likely to elect to give no AP 310 than to give clindamycin as an alternative to amoxicillin.

311 Although AP is no longer recommended before invasive dental procedures for any patients in the UK, it is still the standard of care for patients at high-risk of IE in 312 most parts of the world.^{18, 19} In the USA, and some other parts of the world, AP 313 using oral amoxicillin or clindamycin is often also prescribed before invasive 314 dental procedures for patients with prosthetic joints and a range of other 315 conditions.¹⁶ Indeed, Lockhart et al. have calculated that between 4.9 and 35.6 316 million courses of AP may be prescribed before invasive dental procedures 317 annually in the USA at a cost of between \$19.9 and \$143.7 million.¹⁶ 318

319 Limitations

In the UK, the Yellow Card reporting scheme is used by clinicians, includingdentists, to report adverse drug reactions to the Medicines and Healthcare Products

Regulatory Agency (MHRA). Reporting by healthcare professionals is voluntary 322 and not all adverse reactions are reported. Reported reactions may omit important 323 data or be confounded by other factors. It is also not always certain that the drug 324 identified caused the reported reaction - instead this could relate to the disease 325 being treated, other drugs or completely unrelated factors. Moreover, it is known 326 327 that healthcare workers are more likely to report serious or fatal ADRs than nonserious reactions. Furthermore, reporting is more common for newer drugs or 328 329 those with a high public profile than older established drugs such as amoxicillin 330 and clindamycin. It is also likely that there are minor adverse events that patients 331 fail to report. It is likely, therefore, that these data underestimate the incidence of adverse reactions. These limitations, however, are shared by most other voluntary 332 333 ADR reporting schemes that have been used to estimate ADR rates.

334 A further limitation is that we did not have access to the indication for the antibiotic being prescribed. However, there are few, if any indications for a single 335 3g oral dose of amoxicillin or a single 600mg dose of clindamycin other than to 336 prevent infective endocarditis. The dramatic fall after the change in NICE 337 guidance suggests that this was the principal indication. Furthermore, 338 339 approximately 92% of prescriptions were issued by dentists. We cannot exclude the possibility that some were prescribed for other reasons, however. Anecdotally, 340 in recent years, some dentists have started to use this dose prior to dental implants 341 342 or to treat a dental infection. This may account for some of the residual prescribing. 343

344 **Conclusions**

AP ADR rates in England are low, and lower than previous estimates, with no 345 fatal ADR recorded for nearly 3 million prescriptions of amoxicillin 3g as a single 346 oral dose and 22.62 non-fatal ADR reported per million prescriptions. Use of 347 amoxicillin AP for patients without a previous history of amoxicillin allergy 348 appears safe. In contrast, the use of clindamycin AP was associated with a sizable 349 ADR rate, including 13 fatal and 149 non-fatal ADR reports per million 350 prescriptions, the majority relating to C. difficile infection. These findings should 351 352 be incorporated into future discussions concerning the role of AP in the prevention of IE and calculations concerning its clinical and cost effectiveness. 353

354

355 **Funding:**

This work was supported by Heart Research UK (Simplyhealth grant number: 356 357 RG2632/13/14) and by the National Institute for Dental and Craniofacial Research 358 at the National Institutes of Health (Grant number: 1R03DE023092-01) from the National Institutes for Health. The work of BP was also supported by the Oxford 359 360 Partnership Comprehensive Biomedical Research Centre with funding from the UK Department of Health's National Institute for Health Research Biomedical 361 Research Centre's funding scheme. The views expressed in this publication are 362 those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Department of Health or any 363 of the funders. 364

365 Transparency declarations:

366 LB and PL are members of the American Heart Association's Committee on Rheumatic Fever, Endocarditis, Kawasaki Disease and were involved in producing 367 the 2007 American Heart Association guideline on Prevention of Infective 368 369 Endocarditis. BP was a member of the Task Force on the Prevention, Diagnosis, 370 and Treatment of Infective Endocarditis of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) that produced the 2009 ESC guidelines on the prevention, diagnosis and 371 372 treatment of infective endocarditis. BP also acted as a consultant to the committee that produced the NICE clinical guideline 64 on Prophylaxis Against Infective 373 Endocarditis. We declare no other competing interests. MD is a topic expert (non-374 voting) for the current NICE review of clinical guideline 64. 375

376 **References:**

377 1. Prendergast BD. The changing face of infective endocarditis. *Heart* 2006; 92: 879-85. 378 379 2. Griffin MR, Wilson WR, Edwards WD et al. Infective endocarditis. Olmsted 380 County, Minnesota, 1950 through 1981. Jama 1985; 254: 1199-202. 381 3. Lacassin F, Hoen B, Leport C et al. Procedures associated with infective 382 endocarditis in adults. A case control study. Eur Heart J 1995; 16: 1968-74. 383 Mylonakis E, Calderwood SB. Infective endocarditis in adults. N Engl J Med 2001; 4. 384 **345**: 1318-30. 385 5. Strom BL, Abrutyn E, Berlin JA et al. Dental and cardiac risk factors for infective 386 endocarditis. A population-based, case-control study. Ann Intern Med 1998; 129: 761-9. 387 6 Tlevieh IM, Steckelberg JM, Murad HS et al. Temporal trends in infective 388 endocarditis: a population-based study in Olmsted County, Minnesota. Jama 2005; 293: 389 3022-8. 390 7. Lockhart PB. An analysis of bacteremias during dental extractions. A double-391 blind, placebo-controlled study of chlorhexidine. Arch Intern Med 1996; 156: 513-20. 392 8. Lockhart PB, Brennan MT, Kent ML et al. Impact of amoxicillin prophylaxis on the 393 incidence, nature, and duration of bacteremia in children after intubation and dental 394 procedures. Circulation 2004; 109: 2878-84. 395 Lockhart PB, Loven B, Brennan MT et al. The evidence base for the efficacy of 9. 396 antibiotic prophylaxis in dental practice. J Am Dent Assoc 2007; 138: 458-74; quiz 534-5, 397 437. 398 10. Lockhart PB, Brennan MT, Sasser HC et al. Bacteremia associated with 399 toothbrushing and dental extraction. Circulation 2008; 117: 3118-25. 400 11. Lockhart PB, Brennan MT, Thornhill M et al. Poor oral hygiene as a risk factor for 401 infective endocarditis-related bacteremia. J Am Dent Assoc 2009; 140: 1238-44. 402 12. Durack DT. Prevention of infective endocarditis. N Engl J Med 1995; 332: 38-44. 403 13. Neugut AI, Ghatak AT, Miller RL. Anaphylaxis in the United States: an 404 investigation into its epidemiology. Arch Intern Med 2001; 161: 15-21. 405 Agha Z, Lofgren RP, VanRuiswyk JV. Is antibiotic prophylaxis for bacterial 14. 406 endocarditis cost-effective? Medical decision making : an international journal of the 407 Society for Medical Decision Making 2005; 25: 308-20. 408 15. Ashrafian H, Bogle RG. Antimicrobial prophylaxis for endocarditis: emotion or 409 science? Heart 2007; 93: 5-6. 410 Lockhart PB, Blizzard J, Maslow AL et al. Drug cost implications for antibiotic 16. 411 prophylaxis for dental procedures. Oral surgery, oral medicine, oral pathology and oral 412 radiology 2013; 115: 345-53. 413 17. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Prophylaxis against infective 414 endocarditis. <u>http://www.nice.org.uk/CG064</u> (March 2008. 415 Wilson W, Taubert KA, Gewitz M et al. Prevention of infective endocarditis: 18. 416 guidelines from the American Heart Association: a guideline from the American Heart 417 Association Rheumatic Fever, Endocarditis, and Kawasaki Disease Committee, Council on 418 Cardiovascular Disease in the Young, and the Council on Clinical Cardiology, Council on 419 Cardiovascular Surgery and Anesthesia, and the Quality of Care and Outcomes Research 420 Interdisciplinary Working Group. Circulation 2007; 116: 1736-54. 421 19. Habib G, Hoen B, Tornos P et al. Guidelines on the prevention, diagnosis, and 422 treatment of infective endocarditis (new version 2009): the Task Force on the 423 Prevention, Diagnosis, and Treatment of Infective Endocarditis of the European Society 424 of Cardiology (ESC). Endorsed by the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and

425 Infectious Diseases (ESCMID) and the International Society of Chemotherapy (ISC) for 426 Infection and Cancer. Eur Heart J 2009; 30: 2369-413. 427 Thornhill MH, Dayer MJ, Forde JM et al. Impact of the NICE guideline 20. 428 recommending cessation of antibiotic prophylaxis for prevention of infective 429 endocarditis: before and after study. Bmj 2011; 342: d2392. 430 21. Dayer MJ, Jones S, Prendergast B et al. Incidence of infective endocarditis in 431 England 2000-12: a secular trend, interrupted time-series analysis. The Lancet 2014. 432 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)62007-9 (Access Date Access 2014, date last 433 accessed). 434 22. Kaufman DW. Risk of anaphylaxis in a hospital population in relation to the use 435 of various drugs: an international study. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2003; **12**: 195-202. 436 23. Clemens JD, Ransohoff DF. A quantitative assessment of pre-dental antibiotic 437 prophylaxis for patients with mitral-valve prolapse. JChronic Dis 1984; 37: 531-44. 438 24. Devereux RB, Frary CJ, Kramer-Fox R et al. Cost-effectiveness of infective 439 endocarditis prophylaxis for mitral valve prolapse with or without a mitral regurgitant 440 murmur. Am J Cardiol 1994; 74: 1024-9. 441 Bartlett JG, Chang TW, Gurwith M et al. Antibiotic-associated 25. 442 pseudomembranous colitis due to toxin-producing clostridia. N Engl J Med 1978; 298: 443 531-4. 444 Gurwith MJ, Rabin HR, Love K. Diarrhea associated with clindamycin and 26. 445 ampicillin therapy: preliminary results of a cooperative study. The Journal of infectious 446 diseases 1977; 135 Suppl: S104-10. 447 27. Lusk RH, Fekety FR, Jr., Silva J, Jr. et al. Gastrointestinal side effects of 448 clindamycin and ampicillin therapy. The Journal of infectious diseases 1977; 135 Suppl: 449 S111-9. 450 28. Lee CE, Zembower TR, Fotis MA et al. The incidence of antimicrobial allergies in 451 hospitalized patients: implications regarding prescribing patterns and emerging bacterial 452 resistance. Arch Intern Med 2000; 160: 2819-22. 453 29. Zehnder D, Kunzi UP, Maibach R et al. [Frequency of antibiotics-associated colitis 454 in hospitalized patients in 1974-1991 in "Comprehensive Hospital Drug Monitoring", 455 Bern/St. Gallen]. Schweizerische medizinische Wochenschrift 1995; 125: 676-83. 456 30. Lochmann O, Kohout P, Vymola F. Anaphylactic shock following the 457 administration of clindamycin. Journal of hygiene, epidemiology, microbiology, and 458 immunology 1977; 21: 441-7. 459 31. Raab W. [Acute side effects of erythromycin, lincomycin and clindamycin]. 460 International journal of clinical pharmacology and biopharmacy 1977; 15: 90-7. 461 32. Scully C, Cawson RA. Medical problems in dentistry. Oxford: Butterworth-462 Heinemann, 1998. 463 33. Addy LD, Martin MV. Clindamycin and dentistry. British dental journal 2005; 199: 464 23-6. 465 34. Bombassaro AM, Wetmore SJ, John MA. Clostridium difficile colitis following 466 antibiotic prophylaxis for dental procedures. Journal 2001; 67: 20-2. 467 Bavishi C, Dupont HL. Systematic review: the use of proton pump inhibitors and 35. increased susceptibility to enteric infection. Alimentary pharmacology & therapeutics 468 469 2011; 34: 1269-81. 470 36. Stevens V, Dumyati G, Brown J et al. Differential risk of Clostridium difficile 471 infection with proton pump inhibitor use by level of antibiotic exposure. 472 Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety 2011; 20: 1035-42. 473 Abou Chakra CN, Pepin J, Sirard S et al. Risk factors for recurrence, complications 37. 474 and mortality in Clostridium difficile infection: a systematic review. PloS one 2014; 9: 475 e98400.

- 476 38. Buffie CG, Jarchum I, Equinda M et al. Profound alterations of intestinal
 477 microbiota following a single dose of clindamycin results in sustained susceptibility to
 478 Clostridium difficile-induced colitis. *Infection and immunity* 2012; **80**: 62-73.
 479 39. Macy E. Penicillin and beta-lactam allergy: epidemiology and diagnosis. *Current*
- 480 *allergy and asthma reports* 2014; **14**: 476.

481 40. Macy E, Contreras R. Adverse reactions associated with oral and parenteral use 482 of cephalosporins: A retrospective population-based analysis. *The Journal of allergy and* 483 *clinical immunology* 2014.

484 41. Macy E, Contreras R. Health care use and serious infection prevalence associated
485 with penicillin "allergy" in hospitalized patients: A cohort study. *The Journal of allergy*486 *and clinical immunology* 2014; **133**: 790-6.

- 487 42. Macy E, Ngor E. Recommendations for the management of beta-lactam 488 intolerance. *Clinical reviews in allergy & immunology* 2014; **47**: 46-55.
- 489 43. Branellec A, Thomas M, Fain O et al. [Frequency of self-reported penicillin allergy 490 in the area of Seine-Saint-Denis (France)]. *La Revue de medecine interne / fondee par la* 491 *Societe nationale francaise de medecine interne* 2008; **29**: 271-6.

492 44. Macy E, Poon KYT. Self-reported antibiotic allergy incidence and prevalence: age 493 and sex effects. *The American journal of medicine* 2009; **122**: 778 e1-7.

494 45. Serrano R, Capdevila JA, Mensa J et al. [Multicenter national survey on infection 495 management in patients with penicillin allergy]. *Revista espanola de quimioterapia :*

496 publicacion oficial de la Sociedad Espanola de Quimioterapia 2009; **22**: 10-9.

497 46. Joint Task Force on Practice P, American Academy of Allergy A, Immunology et 498 al. Drug allergy: an updated practice parameter. *Annals of allergy, asthma & immunology*

499 : official publication of the American College of Allergy, Asthma, & Immunology 2010;
500 105: 259-73.

501 47. Macy E, Ngor EW. Safely diagnosing clinically significant penicillin allergy using

- 502 only penicilloyl-poly-lysine, penicillin, and oral amoxicillin. *The journal of allergy and* 503 *clinical immunology In practice* 2013; **1**: 258-63.
- 48. Macy E, Schatz M, Lin C et al. The falling rate of positive penicillin skin tests from

505 1995 to 2007. *The Permanente journal* 2009; **13**: 12-8.

506

507 **Figure legends:**

508 Figure 1. Amoxicillin and clindamycin antibiotic prophylaxis prescribing

509 **data**

510 This figure appears in colour in the online version of JAC and in black and white

511 in the printed version of JAC

- (a) Number of AP prescriptions dispensed each month (single 3g oral dose of amoxicillin [blue bars]; single 600mg oral dose of clindamycin [purple bars]). Note: Figure 1a is similar to a figure we recently had published in the Lancet, but shows a further 10 months of data.²¹
- (b) Number of amoxicillin AP prescriptions dispensed each month, by
 prescriber (dentists red; general practitioners blue; hospitals green;
 nurses purple). Note: number of hospital and nurse prescriptions too
 small to see easily.
- (c) Number of clindamycin AP prescriptions dispensed each month, by
 prescriber (dentists red; general practitioners blue; hospitals green;
 nurses purple). Note: number of hospital and nurse prescriptions too
 small to see easily.
- In each case, the grey bars indicate March 2008, when NICE recommended thecessation of AP for IE.



